

The
American Historical Review

HISTORICAL SYNTHESIS

SOME forty years ago Thomas Buckle published the famous work in which he denounced the historical method then in use and attributed the failure of historians to raise history to the rank of the natural sciences to intellectual inferiority on their part. Of the zeal displayed in research and "of the immense value of that vast body of facts" that had been brought together Buckle had only words of praise. "But if, on the other hand," he went on, "we are to describe the use that has been made of these materials, we must draw a very different picture. The unfortunate peculiarity of the history of man is, that although its separate parts have been examined with considerable ability, hardly any one has attempted to combine them into a whole and ascertain the way in which they are connected with each other. In all the other great fields of inquiry the necessity of generalization is universally admitted, and noble efforts are being made to rise from particular facts in order to discover the laws by which those facts are governed. So far, however, is this from being the usual course of historians, that among them a strange idea prevails, that their business is merely to relate events, which they may occasionally enliven by such moral and political reflections as seem likely to be useful."¹

Buckle believed that "the establishment of this narrow standard" had led to results "very prejudicial to the progress of our knowledge." He acknowledged that "since the early part of the eighteenth century, a few great thinkers" had indeed arisen, who had deplored "the backwardness of history," and had done everything in their power to remedy it. These instances had, however, been extremely rare, and it seemed desirable to him that something

¹ Henry Thomas Buckle, *History of Civilization in England* (2 vols., New York, 1871), I. 3.

should be done "on a scale far larger" than had hitherto been attempted, "and that a strenuous effort should be made to bring this great department of inquiry to a level with other departments, in order that we may maintain the balance and harmony of our knowledge." He hoped "to accomplish for the history of man something equivalent, or at all events analogous," to what had been effected "by other inquirers for the different branches of natural science. In regard to nature, events apparently the most irregular and capricious have been explained and have been shown to be in accordance with certain fixed and universal laws. This has been done because men of ability, and above all, men of patient, untiring thought, have studied natural events with the view of discovering their regularity; and if human events were subjected to a similar treatment, we have every right to expect similar results. . . . This expectation of discovering regularity in the midst of confusion is so familiar to scientific men, that among the most eminent of them it becomes an article of faith; and if the expectation is not generally found among historians, it must be ascribed partly to their being of inferior ability to the investigators of nature, and partly to the greater complexity of those social phenomena with which their studies are concerned." He claimed that "the most celebrated historians are manifestly inferior to the most successful cultivators of physical science: no one having devoted himself to history who in point of intellect is at all to be compared with Kepler, Newton, or many others that might be named." He added, in a foot-note, that he spoke "merely of those that made history their main pursuit. Bacon wrote on it, but only as a subordinate object; and it evidently cost him nothing like the thought which he devoted to other subjects."¹

The idea of raising history to the rank of a science by generalizing upon the social facts and by establishing laws did not originate with Buckle. He had been preceded by Comte, to whom he refers as "a living writer who has done more than any other to raise the standard of history." Comte, Buckle tells us, "contemptuously notices 'l'incohérente compilation de faits déjà improprement qualifiée d'*histoire*.'"²

It is well known that the work of Buckle created a sensation. The discussion that it called forth has engaged the attention of a generation of scholars. To scientists the claim made by Buckle, that history could be made a science only by applying to social phenomena the method that had accomplished so much in investi-

¹ *Ibid.*, I. 5.

² *Ibid.*, I. 4.

gating physical phenomena, appeared almost if not quite axiomatic ; to historians it was rank heresy. They not only denied that they had anything to do with historical laws, but asserted that such things could not be. The arguments made by the historians were not convincing. Droysen, in his defense of the historical method,¹ acknowledged that "our science has not yet set its theory and system on a firm footing." "The recognition will not be denied to historical studies," he said, "that even they have some part in the intellectual movement of our age, that they are active in discovering the new, in investigating anew what has been transmitted, and in presenting results in appropriate form. But when asked their scientific justification and their relation to the other circles of human knowledge, when asked what is the foundation of their procedure, what the connection of their means and their problems, they are, up to date, in no condition to give satisfactory information."

These questions Droysen did not answer in a convincing manner. When he asked, "Is there, then, never more than one way, one method of knowledge? Do not its methods incessantly vary according to their objects?", he was touching the root of the whole discussion; but he did not make clear what these methods are that give us respectively natural science or history. He claimed that the mind "apprehends spatial manifestations as nature and temporal occurrences as history; not because they are so and so distinguished objectively, but in order to be able to grasp and think them"; but he offered no satisfactory discussion of the logical difference between the synthesis of the natural sciences and of history. He even rendered the problem more complicated by treating history as a science of the moral world.

The real point at issue — although not fully understood by either side in the debate — was a question of synthesis, of what form should be given to the facts that had been established as the result of the critical work. To improve the work of criticism, to lay down axioms for the establishment of the historical facts, would in no wise meet the objections of the natural scientist to the method — or the absence of method, as he considered it — of the historian. This was, however, exactly what Rhomberg hoped to do in his monograph entitled *Die Erhebung der Geschichte zum Range einer Wissenschaft*.² While the work was a valuable contribution to the litera-

¹ The discussion of the subject by Droysen is found in the two articles entitled "The Elevation of History to the Rank of a Science", and "Nature and History," translations of which are appended to the translation, by Dr. Andrews, of Droysen's *Grundriss*, under the title *Outline of the Principles of History* (Boston, 1893).

² Adolf Rhomberg, *Die Erhebung der Geschichte zum Range einer Wissenschaft* (Leipzig, 1883). Rhomberg chose for the motto of his book, "Erst die Gewissheit

ture of historical criticism, it had no influence, naturally, upon a discussion that dealt with the question of historical synthesis.

Although the natural scientists appeared to have the better of the argument — for logic offered no aid to the historian — men did not cease to write history in the old way. There seemed to be a feeling that even if the historical method could not be justified in the eyes of natural scientists, even if it were not scientific, it was doing something that needed to be done, and that could not be done by the use of the method of natural science. It was noticeable, however, that by the side of history was growing up a new science, dealing also with the life of man in society, but employing the method of natural science and engaged in the search for regularity and law. This science had accepted the name employed by Comte¹, and called itself sociology. It even claimed to be the science of history that Buckle had hoped to call into being. History was simply a work of "erudition"²; the task of the historian was to prepare the material from which the laws of the sociologist were to be derived. The historian refused, however, to play the rôle of man-servant to the new science, and the discussion lived on although conducted with less vigor than in the days of Buckle.

Some ten years ago, new life was breathed into the controversy by Professor Lamprecht of Leipzig. He announced the discovery of a new historical method the application of which would give a

macht die Wissenschaft zur Macht." In his statement of the problem (p. 12) he said, "Was nun der Historiker gewiss zu machen hat, das ist eigentlich die *Thatsächlichkeit* des gemeldeten Factums." Certainty concerning the facts of history would, he believed, raise history to the rank of a science. The same idea appears in Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* (edition of 1894), 237.

¹ Paul Barth, *Die Philosophie der Geschichte als Sociologie* (Leipzig, 1897), 33, note.

² P. Lacombe, *De l'Histoire Considérée comme Science* (Paris, 1894), VII. 3. The attitude of the sociologist for a long time — and for the most of them even to-day — toward the historical method is well formulated by Lacombe: "Je rapelle en mon esprit la définition de la science, et je me dis: Si les hommes, dans leurs actes, dans leur conduite, ont jamais présenté quelque similitude, celle-ci pourra faire l'objet d'une proposition générale. L'histoire sera une science possible, dans la mesure où ces similitudes s'offriront. Par contre, si l'humanité n'a aucune ressemblance avec elle-même, si la conduite de chacun des hommes qui ont passé a parfaitement différé de la conduite des autres, l'histoire ne sera jamais une science."

Louis Bordeau, *L'Histoire et les Historiens* (Paris, 1888), 1: "L'histoire est toute à refaire ou plutôt elle n'est pas encore faite. Les fondements mêmes de la science sont à établir. La construction attend son architecte. A peine peut-on dire que le passé nous a légué des matériaux. . . . [One of the conditions of a science is that] les connaissances acquises doivent pouvoir être formulées en lois. . . . [History did not meet this requirement] sa capacité d'établir des lois, nulle."

Paul Mougeolle, *Les Problèmes de l'Histoire* (Paris, 1886), 40, in which he considers the problems of sociology, assumes that it is a question of either history or sociology: "On peut dire qu'aucun historien avant Montesquieu, sans en excepter Bodin lui-même, n'a aperçu clairement l'idée de loi."

"new history."¹ It was simply the old question of historical synthesis, this time treated clearly as a question of synthesis. Stripped of all its local and temporal peculiarities, it was simply the old attempt to raise history to the rank of a science by applying to it the method of the natural sciences. The proof of this statement would seem to be found in the fact that in spite of his theories Lamprecht's history did not differ in form from that of the historians that had preceded him,² and that if he had applied his theory he would have produced a sociology and not a history. It is not my purpose to add to the controversial literature that has been produced in the discussion between Lamprecht and his opponents. I would simply call attention to the fact that Lamprecht asserts that the old historical synthesis is unscientific and that there is but one scientific method of approach to any subject of investigation.³ It is the purpose of this article to raise a reasonable doubt upon the question that has been the whole matter at issue between the historians and the natural scientists during the last half-century.

This question that has long divided the world of scholars is evidently, in the last analysis, a question of logic and of the theory of knowledge. It is the question asked by Droysen, but as yet unanswered: "Is there, then, never more than one way, one method of knowledge? Do not its methods incessantly vary according to their objects?" To this question the old logic gave no answer, or it assumed that there is but one kind of knowledge worth seeking and but one method. Logic was under the spell of the natural sciences. It had grown up under the influence of the natural sciences, it selected nearly all of its illustrations from them, and its

¹ Lamprecht's theory is formulated in *Die kulturhistorische Methode* (Berlin, 1900), and in an article entitled "Über den Begriff der Geschichte und über historische und psychologische Gesetze," in the *Annalen der Naturphilosophie*, Vol. II., No. 2. History is "die Wissenschaft von den seelischen Veränderungen menschlicher Gemeinschaften" (*Die kulturhistorische Methode*, 15). What is sociology? Science "ist nichts anderes als der Versuch, die Welt der Erscheinungen höheren Begriffen und Begriffssystemen zu unterstellen, als sie die Sprache schon darbietet" (*Ibid.*, 6). Concepts with general or with individual contents? Are these "systems" of concepts laws or complex wholes? Lamprecht's concepts are evidently concepts with general contents (*Ibid.*, 25-29). Lamprecht's distinction between *Geschichtsschreibung* and *Geschichtswissenschaft* is evidently the same thing as history and sociology (*Ibid.*, 35).

² "Meine Deutsche Geschichte ist das erste historische Werk, das nach den Begriffen solcher Kulturzeitalter disponiert ist und damit die Entwicklung des deutschen Volkes nach den Forderungen der kulturhistorischen Methode darstellt" (*Ibid.*, 26). That there is any logical difference between the method employed in writing the volume of this history devoted to the German Reformation and the method employed by Ranke in dealing with the same subject is not clear to the uninitiated.

³ In both the articles referred to above he traces the history of the development of the sciences and endeavors to make clear why historical science has not kept pace in its development with the natural sciences.

general theories were constructed upon a natural-science basis.¹ It had not, for the most part, occurred to the modern logician that there could be any other point of view. When the natural scientist asserted that the method of the historian was illogical, he was speaking by the book; logic bore him out. If, now, logic should free itself, should discover that the method is determined by the end; that there is no one method that can give us the whole truth; that there are some things that we want to know, that we have a right to know, and that cannot be discovered by the method of natural science, then historical science would come at last to a consciousness of its method and would be able to justify its procedure.

While Lamprecht was congratulating himself that the new school of historians had driven the old school from the field or had left to them the pursuit of something that could not logically be called a science,² this long domination of the natural-science method in logic was coming to an end and the foundation upon which he had built up his theories was being undermined. As early as 1888, in his study *Zur Lehre von der Definition*, Rickert had attacked the idea of a universal natural-science method and had sought to show "how meaningless the theory is in accordance with which the common elements of things are identical with the essential characteristics of their concepts." "It had become clear to me," he wrote later, "that there is always need of a definite object by means of which the essential characteristics may be separated from the unessential; and that, in theories of methods, the important thing is to become acquainted with these various objects in order to understand and do justice to the manifoldness of scientific methods."³ In the same year appeared the treatise by Naville entitled *De la Classification des Sciences*, in which he arranged the sciences in three groups: the first, entitled "histoire," comprised the sciences of the reality; the second, or "théorématique," dealing with what might be called the natural sciences, he characterized as "the sciences of the necessary

¹ Wilhelm Windelband, *Geschichte und Naturwissenschaft* (Strassburg, 1900, zweite Auflage), 13, 14.

² "Die Geschichtsschreibung bleibt nach wie vor ein künstlerisches Geschäft, denn sie wirkt auf die Anschauung und beschäftigt sich gewöhnlich mit dem was an den geschichtlichen Vorgängen als singular erscheint" (*Die kulturhistorische Methode*, 35). It is clear from Professor Dow's article on "Features of the new History" (*AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, April, 1898), in which he makes a synthesis of Lamprecht's ideas as found in his different pamphlets, that the "old method," largely outgrown, is being rapidly replaced by the "new method," based upon psychology and seeking for the "typical stages" in social development. "Whatever the rational has not yet conquered" is left to those "who see at the basis the singular, not the regular."

³ Heinrich Rickert, *Zur Lehre von der Definition* (Freiburg i. B., 1888). The quotation is from the *Vorwort* to *Die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung*.

conditions of the possible, or the sciences of law."¹ Simmel in 1892 declared that "In so far as it is the affair of historical science to describe what has actually occurred, in that it is above all things the science of reality, it stands in the sharpest imaginable contrast to all sciences of law."² Finally in 1894 Windelband,³ rejecting the common division of the sciences into *Naturwissenschaften* and *Geisteswissenschaften*, and adopting as the principle of division the end aimed at, proposed the classification *sciences of law* and *sciences of events*, or in other words, natural science and history. Two years later Rickert published the first part of his work *Die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung*.⁴ It was the negative portion of his treatise, and I shall deal with it in connection with the positive treatment of the theory that appeared in 1902.

All of these conceptions of the relation of natural science to historical science had much in common, and testified to a coming change in the conception of the logic of the sciences. The literature of the discussion was enriched in 1899 by two important contributions, one by a psychologist, Münsterberg,⁵ the other by an

¹ Rickert, *Die naturwissenschaftliche Begriffsbildung*, 299. Naville's monograph is out of print and I have been unable to obtain a copy of it. In 1901 M. Naville reprinted his work under the title *Nouvelle Classification des Sciences*. He there defines history as the "science des réalités diverses dans l'espace et changeantes dans le temps" (Berr in *Revue de Synthèse Historique*, June, 1902, 294). Berr notes "une tendance croissante à faire d'une définition de l'histoire la base de la classification des sciences" (*Ibid.*).

² Georg Simmel, *Die Probleme der Geschichtsphilosophie* (Leipzig, 1892), 43.

³ Wilhelm Windelband, *Geschichte und Naturwissenschaft*, 16-19.

⁴ The first three chapters of the work appeared in 1896, the last two in 1902. The chapters and their subdivisions are as follows: I. Die begriffliche Erkenntnis der Körperwelt. (1) Die Mannigfaltigkeit der Körperwelt und ihre Vereinfachung durch die allgemeine Wortbedeutung. (2) Die Bestimmtheit des Begriffes. (3) Die Geltung des Begriffes. (4) Dingbegriffe und Relationsbegriffe. (5) Die mechanische Naturauffassung. (6) Beschreibung und Erklärung. II. Natur und Geist. (1) Physisch und Psychisch. (2) Die begriffliche Erkenntnis des Seelenlebens. (3) Naturwissenschaft und Geisteswissenschaft. III. Natur und Geschichte. (1) Die naturwissenschaftliche Begriffsbildung und die empirische Wirklichkeit. (2) Der Begriff des Historischen. (3) Die historischen Bestandtheile in den Naturwissenschaften. (4) Naturwissenschaft und Geschichtswissenschaft. IV. Die historische Begriffsbildung. (1) Das Problem der historischen Begriffsbildung. (2) Das historische Individuum. (3) Die teleologische Begriffsbildung. (4) Der historische Zusammenhang. (5) Die geschichtliche Entwicklung. (6) Die naturwissenschaftlichen Bestandtheile in den historischen Wissenschaften. (7) Geschichtswissenschaft und Geisteswissenschaft. (8) Die historischen Kulturwissenschaften. V. Naturphilosophie und Geschichtsphilosophie. (1) Die naturalistische Geschichtsphilosophie. (2) Die empirische Objektivität. (3) Die metaphysische Objektivität. (4) Der erkenntnistheoretische Subjektivismus. (5) Die kritische Objektivität. (6) Naturwissenschaftliche und historische Weltanschauung.

⁵ Münsterberg's paper was read before the American Philosophical Society, and appeared in the *Psychological Review* (January, 1899). The title was "History and Psychology." It was reprinted in 1899 as chapter five, or as the fifth paper, in *Psychology and Life*.

historian, Xénopol.¹ Münsterberg, wishing to free psychology from the danger of a too intimate association with history, attempted a new classification of the sciences that he might assign to each its own province. While he declared himself in sympathy with the effort of German logicians to separate psychology from history, and looked upon such "logical separation as a liberating deed," he considered the arguments that had led to this separation "mistaken and untenable in every respect." He asserted that the difference between psychology and history is "not in the kind of treatment, but in the material itself", psychology dealing with objects, history with subjective will-attitudes. He formed four groups of sciences corresponding to four groups of facts in reality :

We have the science of the over-individual objects, that is, physics ; secondly, the science of the individual objects, that is, psychology ; thirdly, the sciences of the over-individual will-acts, that is, the normative sciences ; and last, and not least, the sciences of the individual will-acts, that is, the historical sciences. Physics and psychology have thus to do with objects ; history and the normative systems, ethics, logic, esthetics, deal with will-acts. Physics and history have thus absolutely different material ; the one can never deal with the substance of the other, and thus they are separated by a chasm, but their method is the same. Both connect their material ; both consider the single experience under the point of view of the totality, working from the special facts towards the general facts, from the experience toward the system.

Elsewhere in the same article Münsterberg states that history as distinguished from psychology has nothing to do with causal connections :

The manifoldness of will-acts, the totality of which forms my real personality, thus refers in every act to the will-acts and attitudes of other subjects which I acknowledge or oppose, imitate or overcome. These demands and suggestions of others are not in question in my life as causes or partial causes of my will ; they have not to be sought in the interest of a causal connection ; they are merely conditions which I as subject of attitude and acts presuppose for my free decision, and which are logically contained in it ; the connection is, therefore, not a causal, but merely a teleological one. The endless world of will-acts which stands thus in teleologically determining relation to our will-attitudes forms the only material of history.

As the practice of the historian does not agree with the logic of the method as Münsterberg has formulated it, he criticizes the practice :

A history which interprets subjectively and understands their purposes out of the deeds of men relinquishes, indeed, its only aim if it coördinates these teleological relations with the causal explanation of human happenings from climatic and geographical, technical and economical, physiological and pathological influences. The subject which is determined by purposes is free ; the action which is the effect of causes is unfree.

¹ A. D. Xénopol, *Les Principes Fondamentaux de l'Histoire* (Paris, 1899).

When Münsterberg wrote this paper the second part of Rickert's work had not appeared and a clear understanding of Rickert's logic of the historical method was not possible. I shall refer to Münsterberg's theory again in presenting the outline of Rickert's logic.

The point of view of Xénopol in *Les Principes Fondamentaux de l'Histoire* is closer to that of the first group of writers and agrees, for the most part, with the teachings of Rickert. All phenomena he divided into two classes, *coexistent facts*, afterwards called *repeated facts*, and *successive facts*.¹ The natural sciences deal with the former, the historical sciences with the latter. In a review of Rickert's volume in 1902 Xénopol formulated the substance of his theory of the historical method:

History deals only with phenomena individualized by time, that is to say, those that are produced but once in the course of the ages; such a conception could not furnish opportunity for the formation of notions of law, but only for that of unique and particular series; causality can only assume (in history) the same serial form and not that of repetition under the form of laws independent of time; this conception applies as well to the history of the human mind as to that of the earth and organisms; it is not in applying to history the method of the natural sciences that this discipline will be raised to the rank of a science, but it is necessary, on the contrary, to complete the logic of repetition by that of succession.²

Xénopol's work was valuable and interesting, but his formulation of the logic of historical method was not sufficiently definite. Are all successive facts historical facts? If not, by what means do we distinguish the essential, or historical successive facts, from the unessential? Xénopol did not answer that question.³ More than that, two kinds of phenomena certainly do not exist. Repeated facts and successive facts are simply two points of view, all the facts of reality being unique and unrepeatable. Failing to see that successive facts might also be repeated facts, if the unique in several series be eliminated, leaving only what is common in the succession, he denied the possibility of formulating sociological laws.

Rickert's complete treatise, containing both the negative portion of the theory that had appeared in 1896 and the new positive portion, was published in 1902. It was the first detailed attempt to formulate the logic of the historical method. Whatever may be the final judgment of logicians upon his theory, it is a serious piece of

¹ In the first chapter, "Les Phénomènes Coexistants et les Phénomènes Successifs," Xénopol presents his theory of the classification of the sciences. His most important contribution to the theory of historical synthesis is in chapters ten and eleven, where he deals with the historical series and causal connection.

² *Revue de Synthèse Historique* (June, 1902), 292.

³ See Rickert's criticism of this point in *Die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung*, 450.

work and must be taken seriously.¹ It is not the outcome of the Lamprecht discussion, the theory having been conceived and partly formulated before any such discussion existed. It is likely to transform the old logic and, supplying a scientific basis for the methods of history and of natural science, put an end to a discussion that has lasted long and has been largely due to a mutual misunderstanding. There would seem, then, to be sufficient reasons for calling the attention of historians to the outlines of Rickert's logic of the historical sciences.

The attempt to formulate the logic of the historical sciences was the natural result of the conclusion reached by Rickert in 1888, that the object of a science determined what its method should be.² Unable to see how there could be a universal method, he naturally rejected the claims of universal applicability made for the method of the natural sciences. Instead of proceeding directly to formulate the logic of the historical sciences, he decided to clear the ground by determining the limits of the application of the natural-science method, or in his language, the limits to the formation of natural-science concepts. What the method of the natural science could not do must be done, clearly, by some other method. The problem was not one of research, but of the formulation of the results of research.³

¹ Lamprecht (*Die kulturhistorische Methode*, 24), while discussing the logic of the historical method, makes the following reference to Rickert's scholarly work: "Freilich kann man der Ideenlehre noch von einer anderen Seite zu Hilfe kommen. Man kann dogmatisch erklären, die singuläre Seite der Vorgänge sei in der Geschichte unter allen Umständen die wesentliche; da ihr Erfassen nur auf dem Wege der Idee erfolgen könne und die Ideen die Annahme einer historischen Kausalität ausschließen, so sei eben die gewöhnliche herkömmliche Logik, welche auf dem Kausalitätsgesetze beruht, für die Geschichte nicht anwendbar, und es müsse deshalb deren Gültigkeit bestritten und eine neue, der Geschichte in Singulärauffassung und damit allen Geisteswissenschaften genügende Logik erst erfunden werden. Diesen Ausweg hat neuerdings ein Philosoph in der That vorgeschlagen; er braucht wohl nicht erst kritisiert zu werden." Certainly even if the book "does not deserve to be criticized," it deserves to be read carefully enough so that its contents may be correctly stated!

² In his monograph *Zur Lehre von der Definition*, 28, 29, Rickert expressed himself as follows: "Jede Wissenschaft hat vielmehr ihre eigene Methode, die sie sich selbst schafft, und die ihren Zielen und Absichten angemessen sein muss. Und wie wir das menschliche Denken nur aus dem Zwecke heraus verstehen können, dass es die Wahrheit finden will, so werden wir auch die Methoden der einzelnen Wissenschaften nur aus ihren speziellen Zwecken heraus begreifen. Wir müssen daher, um zu verstehen, was wesentliche und unwesentliche Merkmale sind, einzelne Wissenschaften gesondert betrachten. Für eine Universalmethode würde allerdings alles in der Welt gleich wesentlich sein. Für die Methode einer Sonderwissenschaft, die sich eine beschränkte Aufgabe stellt, kommt nur ein Theil des Weltganzen in Betracht, und die Unterscheidung des Wesentlichen und Unwesentlichen ist gar nicht zu umgehen. Ein Kriterium für die Unterscheidung können wir natürlich wieder nur aus der Aufgabe gewinnen, welche eine Wissenschaft stellt." See also *ibid.*, 39.

³ The fact that it is a problem of the *Auffassung*, or synthesis, with which we have to do, of the way in which the facts are put together, and not criticism, the way in which

What, then, is the end of the natural sciences, or what is the task of the natural-science concept, and how is this end attained? The world of reality is manifold, endless in extent, and infinite in variety. To enable a finite mind to comprehend this reality some method of simplification is indispensable. The task of the natural-science concept is found in this attempt to overcome the extensive and intensive manifoldness of things for the purpose of attaining a scientific knowledge of the reality. The means for the accomplishment of this task are found already existent in the language of every day. The employment of terms, or concepts, to indicate what is common to a number of objects is a process of simplification and the beginning of the natural-science method. But in the common language these general terms are inexact and need to be modified somewhat before they can serve a scientific end; they must be not only general, but definite and universally valid. Their indefiniteness is due to the difficulty of separating general terms from special associations; this is overcome by definition and by the substitution of concepts of relations for concepts of things, indefiniteness being largely associated with concepts of things from which it is practically impossible to eliminate all traces of the perceptible reality. In pursuit of its ideal the natural-science method, striving to become ever more exact, transforms the concepts of things ever more into concepts of relations, until in the most highly developed form of natural science the thing has become a final thing, an atom. In mechanics we have the natural-science conception of corporeal nature. "Natural science teaches that the reality that presents itself to us as so endlessly manifold is at bottom always and everywhere the same. All variety and all change rest upon the movement of an unchangeable elementary substratum in space."¹ Just as mechanics works with final, imperceptible things called atoms and with a law of motion, so psychology for the world of mind deals with simple sensations — things that do not exist in reality — and the law of association. But the attainment of the ideal of the natural sciences does not depend alone upon the elimination of the perceptible from the concept, and the transformation of concepts of things into concepts of relations; it depends also upon the assumption that what is found to be true for a part of the reality is true for the whole of reality, in other words, that the concepts of natural science are universally valid.

we determine what the facts are, is an indication that the historian is progressing in the consciousness of his method. *Heuristik* and criticism do not enter into the discussion. So much has been won. This discussion will leave us with a clearer idea of what synthesis is.

¹ Rickert, *Die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung*, 100.

The logical sense of the term nature, then, in the expression natural science, is not the reality *per se*, but the reality interpreted, looked at from the point of view of the general or universal. The more successful the method is in formulating general concepts, or laws, and in combining these laws into systems, the nearer it approaches to its ideal, but, at the same time, the less this system contains of the perceptible reality. In the interest of exactness, the natural-science method endeavors to eliminate this disturbing element as much as possible from its concepts, but into many of the natural sciences there enters a large historical element that interferes with the attainment of the ideal. In mechanics it is entirely absent, but it appears in physics, and increases as we pass through chemistry and biology to sociology. The physicist assumes the existence of light, heat, and sound, but it might well be asked, when and where did light first appear? Naturally this is a problem that, on account of lack of evidence, will never be solved, but the historical question of the origin of the chemical elements is one that can be treated and has already been treated. The presence of the historical element in the material that the natural scientist deals with does not modify the point of view in his work nor the application of the method. Whether it be the reality of social life, of organic life, of chemistry, or of physics, he always regards it from the point of view of the general; and his generalizations are valid for the portion of the reality with which he deals. As he passes from a narrower to a broader field, his laws are valid for more and more of the reality, but what they gain in comprehensiveness they lose in content. Although the laws or concepts of natural science assume the existence of the reality for which they are valid, the unique reality enters into its system only by way of example; and natural science, which aims to comprehend the reality under the point of view of the general, has no interest in the unique reality as such. No single event and no single series can be inferred from natural-science concepts that take cognizance only of the general. "We know that a certain seed brought to a certain place is fruitful; and we know that there are birds and insects that carry it; but that to exactly this place a bird or insect will bring this seed no natural scientist can foresee."¹ As natural science cannot foresee a unique event, no more can it tell us of the unique past. "Law has an ideal character, no bridge leads from it to the tangible reality."² As long as

¹ Richard M. Meyer, "Über die Möglichkeit historischer Gesetze," in *Historische Vierteljahrschrift* (April 14, 1903), 165. All that Meyer writes about the possibility of historical laws would be admitted as applying to sociological laws.

² Simmel, *Die Probleme der Geschichtsphilosophie*, 42.

its aim is to simplify the reality in order to comprehend it ; as long as it works with what is common to a number of objects and not with what is unique ; as long as it is forced to eliminate the perceptible in the interest of exactness, since the reality is unique and perceptible, it is evident that the nearer the natural-science method is to its ideal, the farther it is from the perceptible reality. The limit, then, to the formation of natural-science concepts is the unique and perceptible reality itself. If we desire to become acquainted with the unique and perceptible reality, we must use some other method than that of the natural sciences. That method is the method of the historical sciences.

The entire empirical reality (psychical as well as corporeal) can be regarded from a point of view entirely different from that of nature. It becomes nature when we consider it from the point of view of the general ; it becomes history when we regard it from the side of the particular. Every empirical science must set out from the directly experienced reality. The most general distinction in methods is to be sought in what the different sciences undertake to do with this reality, that is, it depends on whether they seek the general and the unreal (meaning that which cannot be perceived) in the form of a concept (or law), or the reality (the perceptible) in the special and individual. To natural science falls the one task, to historical science the other.¹

The reality is unique. Nothing repeats itself and no two things are exactly alike. It is with this unique reality that historical science has to do. It cannot comprehend its endless and infinite manifoldness any more than the natural sciences were able to do, but it can comprehend a portion of the reality that could not be comprehended by the other method ; it can present something of the uniqueness of the reality and at the same time retain something of its perceptibility. It must simplify in order to comprehend, but it must simplify in a different manner from the natural sciences. It finds a starting-point in life just as the natural-science method did. Besides the common names, in the vulgar speech, it encounters proper names, terms applied to unique individuals ; it is a beginning of simplification. Not all unique things can enter into the historical sciences. How shall the essential be distinguished from the unessential ? It is the problem of the formation of the historical concept.

But concept suggests generalization, generalization suggests law, and the seeming impossibility of any other method than that of the natural sciences confronts us at the very beginning of the investigation. The difficulty is not so serious as it seems. We cannot think, it is true, without the use of general terms (such as man, king, war, peace), and these terms must be combined to form concepts, but not all concepts are concepts with general contents ; gen-

¹ Rickert, *Die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung*, 255.

eral terms may be so combined as to give a concept with a unique, individual content. "Some men possess military genius" and "Napoleon possessed military genius" are both concepts, both contain general terms, but the introduction of the proper noun into the last sentence makes out of it a concept with an individual content, stating what was true of but one man in all the past. There have been many military geniuses, but there has been but one Napoleon who was a military genius. Concepts without proper names may, also, have individual contents.

It is not, however, yet clear what the bond is that binds the elements of the historical concept together. It cannot be simply the unique and individual that leads us to select one fact rather than another for our historical synthesis, for all facts and all things are individual, a piece of coal being as individual and unique as a Kohinoor diamond. Its uniqueness must be bound up with its indivisibility or unity. The unity of a piece of coal matters little, that of the Kohinoor diamond everything. It loses its uniqueness with its unity. The same is true of a piece of canvas and a head by Titian, a piece of clay and a Sevres vase. The unity of the object, then, has value for us. We have to do here with a question of value, with a standard. Every object in the reality is complex and may attract the attention of the scientist either because of characteristics that it has in common with other objects or because of its unique traits. If the value of an object is due to what is unique in it, it certainly cannot enter into a general concept. Moreover, in describing it the scientist may note only those characteristics upon which its uniqueness and consequently its unity rest.

We thus reach the method of simplification applied by the historian: he chooses from the endless number of individuals those that are valuable because they are unique, whose uniqueness is inseparable from their unity, and that thus have an importance because their loss or destruction would be irreparable. Our interest in an iron band is not historical; our interest in the iron crown of Lombardy is. To overcome the infinite manifoldness of the individual object the historian selects only those features of the object that are distinctive of it, that mark its unity and render it valuable.

The use of the word value seems to introduce an uncertain and arbitrary element into the problem. Valuable for whom? How can there be any agreement among historians touching what unique facts shall be chosen? Will the history of the Reformation written by a Catholic resemble that written by a Protestant? Will the opponents of the French Revolution select the same facts for their synthesis as have been selected by the supporters of it? Undoubt-

edly, if they proceed scientifically. The question of value is not a question of partizanship nor of approval or disapproval; it is a question of importance. Is this fact important for the history of the Reformation? Is an account of the Reformation intelligible without it? The Protestant may love Luther, the Catholic may hate him, but they would agree that Luther is important for the history of the Reformation. This question of values is not decided by popular vote, by the man upon the street, any more than the laws of natural science are settled by careless, unscientific inference. They are the result of careful study and persistent discussion among scientists. The progress in historical synthesis means a growing agreement among scientific historians touching the important facts of this or that period. The historical method is thus teleological in a certain sense. The subject of an historical investigation is a unique thing, the life of an historical personage, a battle, an economic crisis, a period in the life of a people. It forms a unit and its value depends on its unity. It has beginning and end. We know what the end was, and we wish to know what the chain of events was that led up to the final event. We seek such facts, to be wrought up into a synthesis, as may be necessary to show how the end was attained.

The unique individuals with which the historian works are not necessarily persons nor are they single events; they may be the life of a people, the evolution of European society, the evolution of world society, the evolution of the visible universe. Moreover, these individuals are not isolated facts. Only art treats isolated individuals, and history is not art.¹ It deals with a related body of truth; and each of its unique individuals, each of its units, is part of a larger individual or unit and can be understood only when treated in relation to a larger whole. The Protestant Reformation is intelligible only when treated as a part of that larger whole that embraces the entire reform movement in the Latin church in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries; again, the history of the Reformation as a whole must be treated as a part of the whole history of the church, embracing the Eastern and Western churches, or it may be looked upon as a part of the historical life of Europe. The smaller unit is always related to a larger one until the limits of the visible universe are reached, for history deals with the whole of reality. This is the common practice of trained historians to-day, and yet they have been charged with dealing with isolated facts. Münsterberg confounded the formation of larger and larger generalizations, after the manner of natural science, with this grouping of

¹ Jonas Cohn, *Allgemeine Ästhetik* (Leipzig, 1901), 35, 36; Münsterberg, *Psychology and Life*, chapter entitled "Psychology and Art," 145-178.

unique facts into larger and larger wholes. The difference is an important one and is the second point of difference between the two methods. In the selection of the elements for its synthesis, natural science chooses what is common to a number of facts; historical science selects what is important for the whole. What Luther has in common with other Germans might be important for the sociologist; it would not be for historians. It was just the thing that was unique in Luther, that distinguished him from other Germans, that rendered him important for the Reformation and for the whole subsequent life of Germany, that makes him an historical character. In the second place, the synthesis of natural science differs from that of historical science in that the former treats the individual fact as an example under a law, while the latter treats it as a complex part of a complex whole. In natural science, the more comprehensive the generalization, the thinner its content; in historical science, the larger the concept, so much the richer it is. The whole Reformation is more complex and richer in content than any of the parts of the Reformation in Germany, Switzerland, France, Spain, or the Netherlands, because it embraces them all. Furthermore, it should not be forgotten that while the whole is more complex and richer in content than any of its parts, the part retains its individuality and does not simply appear as the illustration of a law. If Buckle could discover no logical synthesis in the works of such a man as Ranke, it was because he was blind to every form of synthesis but that of natural science. When Münsterberg asserts that "Every science considers the single facts in their relations to other facts, works toward connections," he is simply stating what has always been the practice of historians; but when he adds "towards generalities," he is stating what is not the practice and what could not be the practice if history is to remain history. His failure to note that the relation of the fact to other facts is not necessarily that of an example under a law, of a less abstract thing to a more abstract, but may be that of a complex part to a complex whole, leads him to the illogical conclusion that the method of natural science does not differ from that of historical science.

Not only does historical science select the facts important for the whole, instead of those common to all; not only does it treat these units as parts of a complex whole instead of examples under a law; but it traces the causal connection between the facts. How can it trace causal connection without discovering laws and thus applying the method of the natural science? The confusion here is due to another misunderstanding as fundamental as those touching the selecting and grouping of the facts. Causality as a principle,

namely, that there is no effect produced in the empirical reality without a cause, has been treated as synonymous with natural law, that is, that the cause is equal to the effect. From one point of view, the cause is always equal to the effect; it is the point of view of natural science and is true only when we have eliminated what is unique from the series. From another point of view, the cause is never equal to the effect; it is the point of view of historical science. In the first case we speak of causal law; in the second, of causal connection. The points of view are complementary. I describe the battle of Waterloo and trace the causal connection up to the great disaster; I may find small causes producing big effects; it is the truth from one point of view. It cannot be denied that the natural-science method may be applied to the study of the material from which I constructed my historical synthesis, and may produce something quite different. Neither synthesis is false. The points of view are different; that is all. Because paper may be used for writing a letter does not debar us, on an occasion, from using it to light a fire.

The logic of the historical concept is not yet complete. History deals with the reality, and the reality is ever in motion. Our concept must be enriched by the idea of evolution. The expression has many meanings; it is necessary to fix upon one of them as containing the historical idea. Historical evolution means not simply motion, nor change, but a change that is unique and is important on account of its uniqueness. Motion and change, being common to all reality, cannot be the forms of evolution that we are seeking for. Natural science may treat of changes that are repeated and may formulate the laws of change. Sociology, dealing with social data from the point of view of the general, may trace the general process of social evolution, deriving its generalizations from several series of social changes. But a change that is historical must not only be unique, one that has never appeared before and can never appear again in our world, but it must be important on account of its newness. The evolutionary series that the historian constructs is teleological; it has a well-defined beginning and end, and passes through certain definite stages; each stage is important *per se*, and the individual facts are important because they contributed to a certain result.

There are two peculiarities of the absolute historical concept that still remain to be noticed. The natural-science concept is rendered definite by eliminating, as much as possible through definition, the perceptible that clings to the concept. The historical method, whose aim it is to keep as close as possible to the percep-

tible reality, cannot employ this method. It renders its concept definite by producing a clear image of the person or event that it is treating. It often uses for this purpose more material than appears to be logically necessary. The historian, to make definite the concept of Luther, of Napoleon, or of Bismarck, of the Diet of Worms, the retreat from Moscow, or the crowning of the Prussian king at Versailles, uses such material as may be necessary in his judgment to render perceptible the uniqueness of the person or the event. It is this end in view that justifies the description of personal traits, the reproduction of characteristic sayings, and of photographs of persons and places. The second peculiarity is encountered in the treatment of causal connection.

Every actual evolutionary series forms a continuous whole, but if it is divided into definite, teleologically essential stages, the gradual transition from stage to stage is destroyed. A science of the reality cannot permit such gaps to exist, but must fill them out with causal beginnings, that the various stages may be at the same time teleologically distinct and causally connected with one another. Everywhere where this is necessary, constituent parts of the reality become essential that are not teleologically necessary.¹

This accounts for the appearance of secondary persons and events. In the interest of causal connection the writer of an historical biography may and does introduce secondary individuals and events, simply in the interest of causal connection or explanation.

The form of the absolute historical concept is now complete. In forming his concept the historian employs general terms, but he combines them to form a concept with an individual content; the natural scientist forms concepts with general contents. The historian selects unique objects, important for the whole that he is treating, and selects the features of the object that render it important for the whole group; the natural scientist selects the features that are common to all the members of a group. The historian combines his unique, complex individuals into ever larger and more complex wholes, rendering them definite by retaining as far as possible their perceptible characteristics, and tracing the causal connection; the natural scientist forms his concepts into systems that are ever more comprehensive and consequently less complex or more abstract, and seeks for natural laws in which the cause is treated as equal to the effect. The natural scientist deals with the changing reality, but with changes that repeat themselves and thus render generalization possible; the historian deals with a unique teleological series with definite parts, but bound together in the interest of causal connection by elements that are not teleologically essential.

¹ Rickert, *Die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung*, 474.

Were we permitted to deal solely with the absolute concepts in natural science and in historical science, the misunderstanding between the two groups of scientists would be of but short duration. Unfortunately for the peace of mind of truth-seeking men, there are also relative historical concepts; and, more unfortunately still, a relative historical concept does not differ in form from the relative concept in natural science, or the concept that is valid only for a portion of the reality. To render the situation even more confusing, it is possible to have a historical concept that is more comprehensive than a scientific concept. This fact would seem to point to the unsoundness of the claim of the historian to the possession of a method logically different from that of the natural scientist. Every historical narrative contains concepts made up of elements that are common to a group of objects. The description of the condition of the French army on the eve of the Franco-Prussian war, of the German peasants in the time of Luther, of the French peasants under the old régime, deals with a group and forms a concept from what is common to a group and seemingly forms a general concept. This fact does not, however, change the logic of the historical method. The resemblance between the two methods is superficial. Just as the natural-science method, although dealing with a limited portion of the reality, into which the historical element enters, regards it from the point of view of the general and forms concepts valid for all the reality under investigation, so the historical method treats its large groups as unique, complex wholes and selects only such features of the groups as may be sufficient to characterize it. The aims are different; one concept is relatively general, the other is relatively individual. To base a logic of historical method upon concepts with general contents would be impossible, as there is no means of knowing before investigation whether the historically important in a certain portion of the reality can be exhausted by relative historical concepts.

Rickert does not conclude his treatise with the discussion of the logic of the form of the historical concept. He devotes a chapter to the content of the concept, for the purpose of making clear why man is the center of all historical syntheses and why the values with which the historian deals are culture or social values. He goes even further, and realizing that the question may be and has been raised as to whether history, even if it be a science, may make the same claims to objectivity as natural science, he turns in the last chapters of his book to the consideration of this problem and shows that the *apriori* of natural science outnumber those of historical science.

The compression of the arguments of a closely-reasoned work of seven hundred and forty pages into a score of pages is a thankless task and can never serve as a substitute for the original work; it can give little more than conclusions. The arguments justifying these conclusions must be sought in the work itself. It is no new method that Rickert has given; he has endeavored to show that the method that the historian has always employed and employs to-day is the logical one for him to use for the attainment of the end that he has in view; he shows, furthermore, that that end is justifiable and history is even more empirically objective than natural science. As social facts are a part of the empirical reality, he shows that a natural-science point of view is possible for society and that it may even be possible to formulate the laws of social evolution—but these laws are not historical laws, the laws of a unique series. An historical law, a law of what has happened but once and cannot happen again, is a *contradictio in adjecto*.¹

The sociologists and the historians should endeavor to understand each other. At the conclusion of a review of Rickert's logic, based upon an article that gave, and intended to give, only a partial view of it, Lacombe seemed to realize that the difference between the methods of the sociologist and of the historian is due to a difference in point of view, and exclaimed: "Truly, at the end, it seems to me that our debate reduces itself and ends in very small proportions and amounts simply to this: M. Rickert says, 'What you call sociology may be what you will, but not history; I refuse to give it this name, this title.'—And I reply: 'Very well, so be it. We will reserve the name of history for the exposition of past events, such as has been practiced by that kind of studies in all times; but we shall continue to study events in an entirely different manner from you; we shall choose in the matter, in the historical reality, other aspects, other relations than those that alone have the privilege of interesting you; and we shall form a science different from yours. This science will be called sociology or philosophical history, or scientific history, it matters little what, but it will be always history, in this sense, that the historical fact, the human past, will always, indeed, be the object of our science as it is the object of yours.'"

When a sociologist writes like that, the discussion must be near its end. If historians and sociologists can agree that both deal with the past of society, but from different points of view; that one looks at it from the point of view of a unique evolution, and the other from the point of view of general facts and laws; that as their ends

¹ *Ibid.*, 258.

differ, their methods must differ; that there would be no confusion if we retained the term history for the older point of view and employed the term sociology for the later—if these fundamental points could be agreed upon, the debate would be over. Much that has been written in the course of the debate from Comte to Lamprecht is beside the mark. To argue that the natural-science method can be applied to the study of social facts is not to argue that the historical method is outgrown or that sociology can take the place of history. That would seem to be the fundamental defect in the position of Lamprecht. The historical method has not failed to keep abreast of the other sciences because it has not transformed itself into a natural science.¹ Historical method has progressed, not only in criticism, as Lamprecht acknowledges,² but also in synthesis. How can any intelligent man who is not blinded by the belief that the natural-science method is the universal method compare the syntheses of European history produced in the past one hundred years with the syntheses upon the same subjects that were the products of preceding centuries, and say that the modern syntheses are not sounder and more scientific, that we are not working out a synthesis that will finally be accepted in its main outlines by scientific historians the world over? Even to-day historians are agreed upon the general outline of European history, and if they do disagree upon details, so do the natural scientists. Because these latter gentlemen cannot agree upon so fundamental a thing as whether acquired characteristics are transmitted, nobody thinks of substituting the historical method for the natural science method or of dubbing biology an art.

Buckle was both harsh and hasty in his condemnation of historians. To characterize as intellectually inferior the men whose names lend dignity to the long list beginning with Herodotus and extending, in his day, to Ranke, is pardonable only on the ground of youth. That he could not see that men were beginning to examine social phenomena from a new point of view, but that the new point of view did not render the old superfluous, is more intelligible. It is less intelligible after the discussion has lasted for a half-century, after sociology has taken shape and it is known that it is not history and cannot take the place of history. At a time when historical synthesis is steadily increasing in quantity and improving in quality, and when logic itself has at length justified the historical method, it would seem that the time had come to cease treating the

¹ See the pertinent remarks of Xénopol on the natural growth of a method, in the *Revue de Synthèse Historique* (October, 1901), 174-176.

² Lamprecht, *Die kulturhistorische Methode*, 16.

old method as an outgrown point of view, as a kind of alchemy or astrology. As long as men seek for knowledge of the unique evolution of their social past, just so long will the historical method be justifiable and the historical synthesis, the synthesis of Thucydides, of Polybius, of Tacitus, of Gibbon, and of Ranke, will be scientific, although it will never be the synthesis of the natural sciences.

FRED MORROW FLING.

TWO LIVES OF THE EMPEROR CHARLES V.

ROBERTSON'S *Charles V.* appeared in the year 1769 and has since gone through some three dozen editions. The author was paid 4,500 pounds, the largest sum ever received for a work on history up to that time. His praises were loudly sung by many of the greatest men, and even Gibbon expressed himself as proud to be mentioned in the same breath. But perhaps the strongest proof of the estimation in which Robertson has been held is the fact that from that early day until 1902 there was no attempt in the English language to write a history of the period on a similar scale. The man who ruled over more territory than any other king or emperor since Roman times, the man whose reign saw the rise of the Protestant faith, was left without a modern biographer; and generation after generation of English readers was obliged to content itself with that which Robertson had offered.

The appearance, then, of a most careful and thoughtful work¹ by a thoroughly equipped Oxford scholar is a great event for the student of history. Not only is our actual knowledge greatly increased, but we are furnished with a point of vantage from which to look back and see what progress has been made in this field during the past century and a quarter. But first a word must be said about the relative scope of the two works, and it must be noted at the outset that Robertson's introductory "View of the State of Europe," which is the most scholarly part of his work, has no counterpart in Armstrong; that the latter treats of certain topics relating to the New World which Robertson reserves for a separate volume; and that, finally, Armstrong ends his work with 1555, the year of Charles's abdication, while Robertson continues to the Emperor's death in 1558. This latter circumstance is the more curious as Robertson professes to be writing a history of the *reign* and Armstrong of the *life*—distinctions, indeed, which are not logically adhered to by either writer. One last, important difference is, that Armstrong's work is more of a study, Robertson's more of a narrative; the one looks at a question from all sides, the other seems chiefly bent on the artistic representation of a scene or an

¹ *The Emperor Charles V.*, by Edward Armstrong, M.A. (2 vols., Macmillan, 1902).

episode. Here we have, it seems to me, one of the chief contrasts between the old and the new history writing. The present tendency is towards a descriptive and interrogatory style, whereas formerly we had story pure and simple.

One of Robertson's cardinal faults, which does not seem to have troubled his contemporaries, is a one-sidedness and partiality so serious that it is doubtful if a modern critic would have found a word of praise for the book. This is no history of the reign of Charles V.; it is a history of the Reformation, enlivened by details of Charles's campaigns. Martin Luther, not Charles, is the hero; it is Luther's youth and development that are followed at the greatest length; it is of Luther's character that we learn the most details; it is the difficulties that beset Luther and the Protestant princes, not those that beset Charles, that really interest Robertson. Charles, against whom Robertson seems throughout to feel the greatest personal animosity, has been chosen as the merest foil. His reign is a convenient background for church history, that is all; and in his enthusiasm Robertson goes back to the Waldensians, to Wycliffe and Huss, to the Great Schism and the councils of Constance and Basel, to the wicked popes and ecclesiastics of the end of the fifteenth century. We have disquisitions on clerical courts and on clerical immunities, on the manner of taxing the clergy, on the conferring and the reserving of church lands. Robertson credits himself, indeed, with having "avoided entering into any discussion of the theological doctrines of popery," but we are forced to the conclusion that the reader's escape has been but narrow. In secular affairs, except perhaps for Spain, we have no analogous treatment—no characterization of persons, no genesis of institutions. The Empire is a vague generalization; Charles is always "Emperor of Germany." In the "introductory view" there is, indeed, a superficial account of the German diets, which represents those assemblies as "originally . . . exactly the same with the assemblies of March and May, held by the *Kings of France*," and a still more superficial account of the electoral college, in which no mention is made of so important a document as the Golden Bull of Charles IV. Of the early history of the Netherlands and their connection with the Empire, of the so-called Burgundian Circle, of the treaty of 1547 between the Empire and the Netherlands that fixed the relations of those two powers, there is never a word.

Another fault that a modern critic would never pardon is the incomplete use even of the authorities that were easily obtainable at the time. Robertson on one occasion says frankly, "As the several books which contain the information necessary towards dis-

cussing this point with accuracy, are written in the German language, which I do not understand, I can not pretend to enquire into this matter with the same precision wherewith I have endeavored to settle some other controverted facts which have occurred in the course of this history." He might have said the same for the Dutch language and possibly also for Spanish. One can readily estimate the value, from a modern point of view, of a history of a Catholic ruler over Germany, the Netherlands, and Spain, compiled almost exclusively from French, Italian, and Latin Protestant sources! Just so, for matters pertaining to the rivalry of Francis and Charles, Robertson frequently relies on the sole authority of de Bellay, a Frenchman and a general of Francis. For the war with the princes of the League of Schmalkald he takes page after page from Sleidan, the official Protestant chronicler of the league. It is true his authorities are all "original sources," a fact which must have greatly imposed on his contemporaries. But an "original source," if inspired by religious or national prejudice, is the worst possible guide. Even a good source is often best studied through the medium of a competent commentator who will point out the best text, the best interpretation, and the particular application; yet this kind of a guide Robertson seems consistently to have scorned.

In comparison with Robertson, Armstrong's array of authorities is most imposing. After citing in five lines the works that go to form the earlier writer's chief stock in trade, he mentions some thirty great collections of state papers, letters, and diplomatic reports, of acts of diets, and of military and other memoirs; while the preliminary list of modern authorities fills four pages, and throughout the book are scattered numerous references to valuable monographs on special points. Neither Armstrong nor Robertson has used manuscript material, and neither, unfortunately, has made critical remarks, or has given his reasons for accepting or rejecting any particular statement.

If we cease generalizing and turn to individual topics, we shall learn to distinguish with more precision between the achievements of the earlier and those of the later historian. Almost at the outset we are met by an instance of Armstrong's determination to avoid anything like the narrative style or the sonorously rounded periods of his famous predecessor. Be it said in parenthesis that his style is even too careless and colloquial, as when he speaks of Charles as the "travelling director of the Hapsburg syndicate" or says in the language of foot-ball that in war "tries" count not for, but against the side that makes them. To the whole dramatic episode of the contest for the imperial crown Armstrong devotes

little over a page, on the plea that Charles had contributed almost nothing to his own election, and that he, the biographer, means to concern himself only with what personally affected his hero. But surely in this Armstrong has gone too far. Even according to his own reasoning, he should have mentioned the *Wahlcapitulation*, or bill of rights which the electors wrested from the successful candidate; for in this document Charles made agreements which more than once hampered him in the course of his reign. For instance, the leniency shown to Luther in according him a hearing before the Diet of Worms seems to have borne direct relation to the promise to place no one under the ban of the Empire without formal proceedings. For Robertson the famous diet itself is merely an arena in which Luther is to display his bravery; and all the constitutional matters, some of them of great importance, are disposed of in a paltry ten or twelve lines. Armstrong, on the contrary, devotes many pages to showing how during these months while the diet was in session all the great problems of the reign were being formulated—constitutional reform; the attitude to be observed towards the knights and the peasants; the relations with the French, the papacy, the Turks, the Castilian communes, the New World. We learn the political tendencies that were working in Luther's favor, and just why his teachings were likely to become popular with the princes as they already were with the lower classes. We are brought to see plainly why it was that Charles could not possibly consent to the Pope's demand for the immediate condemnation of Luther; how the hearing before the diet marks an important epoch in the life of Charles fully as much as it does a supreme moment in Luther's career; how the young Emperor stifled public discussion by his bold personal intervention; and how bravely, finally, he stood up for his own rights on the whole question of constitutional reform. He could not prevent the establishment of a governing council, but he prevented the serious curtailment of the imperial prerogatives, and so weakened the original proposition that the council, in point of fact, never came into active rivalry with him.

When we come to the happenings in Germany between the Edict of Worms in 1521 and the religious truce of Nuremberg in 1532, we find ourselves in a world almost unknown to Robertson. There is no mention of the Knights' War, nor do the names of Hutten and Sickingen so much as occur in his pages. The governing council is not referred to again. There is no real explanation of the various economic and other causes that drove the peasants to their great revolt. In treating of that struggle itself the misrepresentations are almost ludicrous. The princes, "unwilling to shed the blood of

their deluded subjects, sent a young nobleman to their camp, with the offer of a general pardon, if they would immediately lay down their arms," which unwillingness to shed blood was certainly not apparent later. What the princes really did was to lure the poor peasants on with false negotiations until they themselves could raise and equip their armies. It is Sleidan who leads Robertson to say that "during these commotions Luther acted with exemplary prudence and moderation; like a common parent, solicitous about the welfare of both parties, without sparing the faults or errors of either." No word about the terrible writing "against the murderous and rapacious hordes of the peasants," who are called "brands of hell" and "limbs of Satan," and are consigned to the merciless princes to be "struck down, throttled, and stabbed in secret or in public." There is not much "exemplary moderation" about phrases such as these. Armstrong is entirely in accordance with the evidence when he declares that the reformer "had thrown himself with unseemly violence on the side of authority, and had hounded on the nobles to the extirpation of the wretches who had misunderstood his far from obvious meaning." Naturally Robertson knows nothing of the great cleft that Luther's attitude brought about between himself and the common people, of the change in the reformer's views as to a priesthood emanating from the masses, of his turning and placing his hopes on the territorial princes. All this is admirably brought out by Armstrong: "Luther, shrewd and versatile as he was passionate and stubborn, saw his opportunity and threw his whole energy into the service of the princes. If his doctrines were to survive, they must be associated not with the declining but with the rising element, the territorial state. He had once for all had his fight; he was by nature too conservative, and also too sensible, to be logical or consistent. He had done with the priesthood of the individual, the absolute liberty of conscience, the entire freedom of religion from the state, the election of the ministry by the congregation. Obedience to authority was now to him the first and great commandment. . . . Luther was twitted, not without some reason, with having become a Pope."

In the chapters devoted to the revolt of the communes of Spain, to the wars against Francis I. in Italy, and to the expedition against the Barbary corsairs, we find the old difference of treatment: Robertson narrates, Armstrong investigates and explains. The latter is always in search of motives, causes, and characteristic features; the former's one endeavor seems to be to spin out dramatic episodes to the utmost possible length. It is a pleasure to follow Armstrong as he unfolds the national, religious, social, and economic elements

that caused the Spanish troubles. He makes clear to us what was the actual area of the revolt and compares the disturbances in one section with those in another. With regard to the famous rivalry between Charles and Francis, he shows that it had its origin, long before the imperial election, in a series of bitter humiliations inflicted by Spain upon France. He leads us through the tangled maze of Italian politics with a sure hand, showing the motives and aims of all the powers, large and small. On the question of Charles's responsibility for the sack of Rome he dwells at some length, showing that the Emperor was so far away that it required three months for his communications to reach the army, and that none of his commands or instructions contemplated anything more than an armed demonstration under the walls of Rome. In connection with the African expedition we are told just what comprised the African possessions of Spain, and why their retention was such a vital question.

The diet of Augsburg of 1530 gives Robertson a new opportunity of commiserating these Protestant princes, who are always being intrigued against and wronged. They seem to him so good, so single-minded, so obedient! "At the Emperor's desire, all the Protestant princes forbade the divines who accompanied them to preach in public during their residence at Augsburg"; their zeal "was then of such strength as to overcome attachment to their political interests." As a matter of fact the princes flatly refused to silence their preachers, or even to have them avoid contentious topics, until Charles asserted his right, as head of an imperial town, to decide what form of religion should be tolerated in his presence. Nor does Robertson mention the bitter enmities at this diet between the Protestants themselves — Melancthon's avoidance of Bucer, Philip of Hesse's refusal to hear the sermons of Agricola. There is no word about the *Tetrapolitana*, or separate confession of faith handed in by the four Zwinglian cities of south Germany. Indeed, all through these volumes Zwingli is only once mentioned, and then as an ally of Luther. Of such a scandal as the bigamous marriage of Philip there is not so much as a hint. Yet that scandal to-day is considered a most striking symptom, if not the actual cause, of the decline of the Protestant party. Not merely were Luther and Melancthon severely discredited by their acquiescence in the marriage and by their official countenancing of lying and deceit, but Philip, overwhelmed by the reproaches and scorn of his own friends, went over to the enemy and became the Emperor's ally, receiving a promise of indemnity for the past and protection for the future. It is true he reserved the right of returning to his colleagues should

they be directly attacked, but he did harm enough to his cause by engaging to oppose the admission of England, France, and Guelders into the Schmalkald League. He was a traitor to his cause, for his dealings with Charles were kept a secret.

But it is time for us to turn from a discussion of special episodes to what is, all in all, the most interesting question: how does the Charles of Robertson's pages compare with the man described by Armstrong? Since the Scotch divine wrote his work a great deal of new evidence has come to light, and of the most direct and conclusive kind. We have whole correspondences of the Emperor himself with different members of his family, public and private documents emanating from ministers and from foreign ambassadors, instructions for the guidance of Charles's son. It is important to note, therefore, how far the conventional picture has had to be redrawn. It is true Robertson disclaims any intention of dwelling on the personal, private virtues of the Emperor, reserving his forces for great European movements; but as a matter of fact he is never chary of giving his opinion, and the fact that the disclaimer comes at the end of the book and is joined to a complaint of the difficulty of finding material on the subject robs it of much of its force.

It must be said at once that the Charles of Robertson is one of the most shadowy and unreal persons that ever looked forth from the printed page of a history. He is an imaginary type, not a man who once lived and breathed. He is the conventional ogre of the childish fairy tale, the very Antichrist of the pious Protestant. His "insidious and fraudulent policy" is contrasted with the "open and undesigning characters" even of a Francis I. and a Henry VIII. Throughout one whole portion of the book his name is rarely mentioned without the accompanying epithet "the artful," or other words to convey the same idea. He is always engaging in "intrigues" or concocting "schemes." His own distinguishing characteristic is an "insatiable ambition," an ambition "so rapacious as to be restrained by no consideration either of decency or of justice." He acts "with the mercenary heart of a corsair"; "his ambitious views enlarged in proportion to the increase of his power and grandeur." We hear much of the Emperor's "arrogance." He is "so intoxicated with a single victory as to imagine that he might give law to mankind." "He aimed at rendering the imperial crown hereditary in his family and would, of course, establish in the Empire an absolute dominion." He "gave law to the Germans like a conquered people." We hear of him "boasting of his own power and exploits with insolence." There are a few scanty words of praise for endurance and bravery in the African expedition; and in the

summing up on the occasion of Charles's death there are tributes to one or two other virtues. Everywhere else the cloven foot is brought into prominence. There are reiterated charges of hypocrisy: "notwithstanding the specious veil of religion with which he usually endeavored to cover his actions, Charles, in many instances, appears to have been but little under the influence of religious considerations." When we come to the arrest and imprisonment of the Protestant leaders, Philip of Hesse and John Frederick of Saxony, Robertson's powers of denunciation reach their culmination. In not keeping the bond which the Elector of Brandenburg and Maurice of Saxony had given to Philip, Charles "abrogated at pleasure the most sacred laws of honor and most formal obligations of public faith." "The state of subjection to which the Empire was reduced appeared to be more rigorous as well as intolerable than that of the most wretched and enslaved nations, if the emperor, by an arbitrary decree, might cancel those solemn contracts which are the foundation of that mutual confidence whereby men are held together in social union."

If now we take up the allegations of Robertson and examine them in the light of the very thorough investigations made by Armstrong (who, however, never himself criticizes his predecessor), we shall find Charles turning from a shadow into a thing of flesh and blood. At times he is very human indeed, and far more genial than we are accustomed to imagine him. When entering Siena in 1536, he "was radiant with smiles; he would rein in his horse and joke now with one citizen and now another." "Spying a little Piccolomini, a very pretty child, carried in a servant's arms, he called him up, looked earnestly on the child's face and kissed him." At Aigues Mortes in 1539 he visited his rival Francis I., and the two dined together: "At the dance which followed they would stand, now arm in arm, now hand in hand, bandying jokes with this lady and with that: never had Charles been seen to laugh so heartily." At Innsbruck he once "made as though he would kiss the younger ladies, but disengaged himself as soon as might be from those of riper years" (the words are those of an old chronicle). Armstrong's picture of Charles is all the more trustworthy because he is never his unconditional advocate. The Emperor's slowness, his irresolution, his occasional obstinacy, his lack of original conception are nowhere concealed, and once his policy is declared inexcusable. What Armstrong invariably does, however, and what Robertson as invariably omits, is to show the other side of the case—the tremendous provocation, the patient endurance up to that time, the impossibility, occasionally, of taking any other course. It was, indeed,

an overwhelming task for one man to look after so many realms, confront so many different enemies both at home and abroad, solve so many religious, political, social, commercial, and colonial problems.

Robertson's charge of artfulness is too vague to concern us for more than a moment. From our wider point of view it is difficult to understand why the epithet could not just as well be applied to every great ruler who has had to deal with several enemies at the same time. Frederick the Great, Napoleon, Bismarck were all infinitely more artful than Charles. Charlemagne, perhaps, was not; he had no coalitions to fear, and simply struck down opposition wherever he found it. That Charles V., like any modern diplomatist, refused to carry his plans upon his sleeve; that he often temporized with one set of enemies while sore beset by another; that he concealed his joy at the occasional straits of the Pope and the French king, though outwardly preserving a semblance of decent regret—all this does not constitute an artfulness that must stigmatize his life. As well affix the epithet "the perjured" to every mention of the name of Francis I. Surely Charles never committed an act that even distantly approached in perfidy the French King's premeditated breach of the treaty of Madrid! As a matter of fact, Robertson is so permeated with the idea of Charles's vast, illimitable ambitious designs that he looks upon him as passing his life in trying to conceal them. Never once does he grasp the Emperor's real aims, never once does he appreciate the constant striving for national as well as religious unity, or that composure under adverse circumstances which Melanchthon himself termed "marvellous and glorious."

Armstrong disposes of the charge of overweening ambition, indirectly but conclusively, by showing that the Emperor had a great respect for law and for parliamentary institutions, and that he frequently bowed to adverse judgments; that his aims were actually too conservative for his own good or for the good of Germany: "Throughout this diet [the 'armored diet' of 1548], held at the moment when Charles was at the summit of his power, there is no trace of the autocratic spirit of the *hoc volo sic jubeo*. For each of his proposals he had patiently courted the support of public opinion; he had wished the national representatives to take the initiative. Whenever he was assured that popular feeling was against him, he bowed to it, and withdrew or modified his most cherished schemes. . . . From first to last his attitude was defensive, forced upon him by the movements of his enemies. . . . He never clutched at what was not his own." We have at this juncture Charles's most private instructions for his son Philip — instructions which amount to a polit-

ical will and testament—and they breathe the very spirit of conservatism. Philip is to avoid provocation and only to fight under compulsion. He is to maintain the *status quo* wherever possible, to lighten the burdens of his people, and to rule them with justice. Over against the accusation that Charles aimed at absolute dominion Armstrong places the facts that diets in Germany were called so frequently as to displease even the Protestant princes, and that the Estates General of the Netherlands met more than fifty times during this reign. All that Charles asked for after his great victory at Mühlberg was a closer confederation of all Germany on the model of the Suabian League, and even this proposition he let fall under the opposing fire. This was the one moment when, had he wished it, he might possibly have become absolute; yet he repudiated all advice to that end, and continued, as Armstrong puts it, “to listen as usual to the clamors of the more pushing Protestants and the shrieks of disappointed Catholics.”

Of all the charges brought by Robertson none seems more unfounded than that of hypocrisy. It would be hard to prove a single case where Charles “endeavored to cover his actions with the specious veil of religion.” Although more tolerant than the Pope and the Catholic princes, and far more so than the Protestant princes or than their more modern advocate, he was continuously and consistently loyal to the faith that he professed. He lived for it; he fought for it; and rather than be untrue to it and make a disadvantageous peace with the heretic, he abdicated his throne and gave himself wholly to the observances which that faith prescribed. It is true that once, under excessive provocation from the Pope, he declared that Luther after all might prove a useful man; it is true, too, that he once accepted money from the Moors as a condition of procuring the modification of an edict of the Inquisition; but those are isolated matters not fully understood, and by no means prove that he was a hypocrite. His desire to see the truth prevail seems to have been thoroughly sincere, and in the matter of disputed points of doctrine he always sought the aid of his theologians. He wished peace with the Protestants on the basis of mutual comprehension, to which end he instituted numerous conferences. The Confutation of the Augsburg Confession was returned to its authors no less than five times, to see if its tone might not be softened; and as a last hope, the Emperor even appointed a committee of seven Catholics and seven Protestants to discuss disputed points. Armstrong thinks that Charles in the end had absolutely no option but to accept the Confutation. Had he been ever so yielding to the Lutherans, yet “had his sentence differed a hair’s breadth from the

opinions which Luther at that crisis held, it is unquestionable that no Lutheran, except perhaps Melancthon, would have accepted it. . . . Luther, directing or abusing the Lutheran disputants from his retreat at Coburg, was less the hero of the hour than Charles, who day by day bore the turmoil and the tedium, flouted by Protestants, thwarted by Catholics, yet never losing his composure, never forsaking his conciliatory attitude."

According to Robertson, Charles in 1546 went to war against the Protestant princes solely on account of their religion, though professing other objects; treated the conquered leaders with great cruelty and injustice; and, finally, in the most arbitrary manner imposed the "interim," or temporary norm of faith, on Germany. That a religious element entered into the war is not to be denied; indeed Charles was obliged to emphasize that element, probably more than he wished, in order to consummate the much-needed alliance with the Pope. But he was not hypocritical in contending that he was aiming at the suppression of disobedience rather than of dissent. Armstrong points out that several Protestant princes fought on Charles's side and that those who remained neutral were not molested. In the terms of peace with the towns, religion plays a very small part, and no extra hardship was inflicted on John Frederick for refusing to submit to the decrees of Trent. It was the Protestants themselves who sought to give the war an exclusively religious form: "in a papal country," John Frederick told the burgomaster of Aschaffenburg, "there is nothing neutral." On the whole, Armstrong makes it clear that the war was bound to come, even had Luther never been born and the Reformation never taken place; and he reaches the conclusion that the princes frustrated union with Charles rather from political than from religious motives. What they really feared was imperial consolidation, and to prevent that they were willing to call in the French, the Turks, the English, or even the German papists. Charles had avoided war for thirty years, but it could be avoided no longer if he was to remain master in Germany. The main institutions of the Empire had too often been set at naught; its territory had been seized by individual princes who neither asked for nor received imperial investiture. The Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse had declared their contempt for diets; there had flowed a steady stream of seditious pamphlets; Luther himself had declared that the Emperor was no true emperor, but a tyrant and a devil.

Charles's treatment of the Elector and the Landgrave was not generous, but Armstrong shows that it was not altogether unjust. The list of grievances against the house of Wettin was long and

black. Frederick the Wise had defied the Edict of Worms by hiding Luther in the Wartburg; his successor had drawn up the "Protest" and helped to form the League of Schmalkald. John Frederick himself had aided the rebellious Duke of Cleves and had raised revolt against Ferdinand in Bohemia. The Landgrave of Hesse had intrigued with every one of the Emperor's enemies. Philip's friends maintained that Charles had played the Landgrave horribly false in not keeping the promises made and briefed by the Elector of Brandenburg and Maurice of Saxony. As it happens, a draft of the original agreement exists, and it shows the hollowness of this contention. Philip, indeed, seems really to have been deceived; but the fault rests with the intermediaries, not with Charles. Maurice was warned at the time that he was pledging too much.

Not the least of Charles's alleged crimes was the attempted enforcement of the "interim," which was dubbed at the time a "strait-jacket for Protestantism." Yet even for this Charles is not wholly responsible. Even after his decisive victory he did everything to associate others with him in dealing with the old, unsolvable problem, and again appointed a mixed committee. But, to quote Armstrong, "neither party would stir a finger to promote the peace for which both clamored, nor was either prepared for mutual toleration." And here comes the strangest rectification of Robertson, who intimates that the interim was thrust upon the Protestants by the Archbishop of Mainz's suddenly rising and constituting himself the mouthpiece of the whole diet assembled. As no one had courage or presence of mind to oppose, the whole measure was considered passed without debate. In point of fact the Lutherans, treated with separately, had accepted the interim without much demur; "the Catholics, however, who regarded themselves as victors, although they had contributed nothing to the victory, offered violent opposition." It was as *their* mouthpiece when they did finally acquiesce, that the Archbishop of Mainz, whose "presumption" Robertson considers so "unprecedented and unconstitutional," rose up to express assent. But on the matter of making the interim equally applicable to both parties, the Catholics were inflexible, and that was what made the measure so odious to the Protestants. It became a compulsory, invidious decree, which was far from what Charles had intended; as such it was laughed to scorn and became a dead letter.

In the space at command it has been manifestly impossible to do justice to the more positive excellencies of Armstrong's book. I am inclined to think it one of the calmest, most dispassionate, most

scholarly works on modern continental history ever written by an English pen. It gives an entirely new picture of Charles, a picture that appeals to the sympathies and that strikes one as true. In his final summing up Armstrong designates the Emperor as, "all deductions made, an honorable Christian gentleman, striving, in spite of physical defects, moral temptations, and political impossibilities, to do his duty in that state of life to which an unkind providence had called him. It was not his fault if—to alter a single word of Morosyne's conclusion—'all was a good deal better meant than he could do it.'"

ERNEST F. HENDERSON.

THE FAILURE OF THE HUMBLE PETITION AND ADVICE¹

SINCE a compromise never meets the wishes of any considerable party, it must justify itself by its success in securing the objects desired by its supporters. If the Humble Petition and Advice actually brought "settlement" to the nation, even those who were originally discontented with it would soon give in their adhesion. On the other hand, if it failed in securing this desirable end, all these lukewarm supporters would soon be active opponents of the new government.

In case the Humble Petition and Advice did succeed, then the opinion that the cause of civil government had won a considerable victory would be justified. It soon became apparent, however, that success could not yet be claimed, but that another trial of strength must be made between the army and the sectaries on the one hand, and the staunch upholders of the Humble Petition and Advice on the other. All the supporters of kingship could by no means be counted among the adherents of the new government, since many of them were irrevocably hostile to any government which did not include monarchy; while others, probably more numerous still, were at the best only lukewarm in support. It is true that the compromise had, for the time being, secured the support of Desborough and Fleetwood. But their adherence was of little moment unless they could carry with them a considerable party. It is doubtful, however, if Desborough had any following of importance; while Fleetwood could not possibly secure the allegiance of the larger number of the sectaries, some of whom already reproached

¹ This paper forms the concluding portion of an independent study of the last attempts to settle the government under Cromwell. The two preceding portions related to the failure of the Instrument of Government and to the Humble Petition and Advice and the attempt to make Cromwell king. But while they were receiving their final preparation for the press, there appeared successively Mr. C. H. Firth's two articles in the *English Historical Review* (XVII. 429, July, 1902, and XVIII. 52, January, 1903) on "Cromwell and the Crown," and the first chapter of Mr. Gardiner's fourth volume. These cover so nearly the same ground as the papers described that I do not deem it expedient or useful to print them, though a mention of them seems almost necessary toward explaining the existence and the limits of the present paper.

him with being recreant to the "Good Old Cause."¹ Their support, therefore, could have been of no great moment, and they were determined that no further change should take place.

In this attitude they would be supported by the sectarian party, which had always been fostered by Fleetwood and which still exercised vast influence over the Protector. "That gang," as Henry Cromwell stigmatized it, would certainly hinder settlement. Apparently they feared that kingship had only been deferred, especially since the Humble Petition and Advice, as finally adopted, retained the "other house," or House of Lords. They omitted no opportunity, therefore, of putting difficulties in the way of further change. Many of the soldiers in England thanked Cromwell for his refusal of the title; and attempts were made to secure from some of the Irish officers similar congratulations, apparently without Henry Cromwell's knowledge, though perhaps with that of Fleetwood, who was still lord deputy.²

The irreconcilability of interests is vividly portrayed in a letter of Richard Cromwell's to his brother: "Your owne affaires in the entring into them," he wrote, "gave you some sight of persons, whose designe hath been for a long time layd to take roote, for the hindring Nationall advantages, in settlement, where it might occasion difficulty to there getting into the saddle, respecting there owne ambitious mindes, and advantages before Religion, peace or what else that may stand in there way. I dare not be plainer, as to particulerrize persons, or things, nor need I, you having knowledge of the ffoxes by his Smell." Without doubt Richard referred not only to Lambert, but also to Desborough, and to Fleetwood and his "mad party"; for Henry's entrance into the government of Ireland could have given him insight into the designs only of Fleetwood and those who supported or, rather, led him. In Richard's opinion the conflict of factions was so intense and so irreconcilable as to forebode ruin to the state. "I should relate how things are here," he continues, "and how the Publique Peace is tumbled and tossed, as if it were nothing to breath the veines of one another to a deadly gasping: . . . surely or sicknesses are very greate, and or disease almost incurable, there is noe parte sounde."³

¹ For the attitude of the sectaries see an appeal to Fleetwood, unfortunately without date, in Thurloe, *State Papers*, VI. 244 ff.; also *A Second Narrative of the Late Parliament (so called)*, *Harleian Miscellany* (edition of 1745), III. 454.

² Some thought "that it would bee fitt my Lord Depyte should bee enabled to produce the same Congratulations for yor Highnes refusall from the Army in Ireland as had been made by some in Engld." H. Cromwell to O. Cromwell, June 5, 1657, B.M. Add. MS. 4157, folios 182, 183.

³ R. Cromwell to H. Cromwell, June 10, 1657, Lansdowne MS. 821, folio 125.

Under these circumstances it was all-important that the new settlement should be as little defective and objectionable as possible. Otherwise no considerable party would rally to its support. Examination of the Humble Petition and Advice, however, shows that it was defective in several particulars, and contained clauses which were certain to provoke bitter opposition from the sectaries.

The most significant of these clauses were those concerning religion. The makers of the new constitution were evidently determined to erect a state church in England, and were indeed as much bent upon establishing a church as upon establishing a king. The whole instrument is redolent with this design.¹ The gist of the plan, however, is contained in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth articles. The tenth article voiced the desire of the House that the revilers of godly ministers or their assemblies, and the disturbers of public worship be punished according to law, and that where the laws were defective the Protector should assent to such laws "as shall be made in that behalf." Article 12 ratified all the acts passed by the Long Parliament abolishing the episcopal system, and so made impossible any return to that establishment. To these articles little objection could be made by any of the Puritan factions. The eleventh article, however, was of a far different character. It declared first that the Protestant religion alone should "be held forth and asserted for the public profession of these nations." Then followed what was the kernel of the whole religious plan of the Petition, that a "Confession of Faith" should be agreed upon by Cromwell and the Parliament. This confession was to "be asserted, held forth, and recommended to the people of these nations," and no one was to be suffered in speech or writing "maliciously or contemptuously" to assail it. The article then made a general provision for religious toleration, excluding from this "liberty," however, all Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, and Unitarians, all who denied the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and all such as "publish horrible blasphemies, or practice or hold forth licentiousness or profaneness under the profession of Christ." Provided a minister did not fall in any of these categories, he might differ "in matters of worship and discipline," but he must assent to the Confession of Faith if he was to "be capable of receiving the public maintenance appointed for the ministry." This article, therefore, not only denied toleration to a considerable number of persons who had hitherto possessed it, such as Quakers, Ranters, and Fifth Monarchists,

¹ See for instance Article 4 with its qualifications for members of Parliament, and its revival of the act of August 9, 1650, "against several atheistical, blasphemous, and execrable opinions derogatory to the honour of God, and destructive to human society."

but it pronounced those who did not assent to the public confession incapable of receiving public maintenance. The tithes and the ecclesiastical property of the state were to be devoted to a body of men holding a certain set of religious tenets. It is impossible to state definitely what these tenets were to be, but there can be little doubt that if Parliament had had its way, the new establishment would have been a modified form of Presbyterianism. Oliver would presumably oppose a Presbyterian system, yet it is conceivable that in time he would have consented to this; and certainly to accept Presbyterianism could not have been more difficult than to accept kingship. Indeed it is plain that now the two stood together, for the intense opposition of the sectaries in itself made any other combination impossible. Cromwell warmly approved of the Petition's provisions regarding religion,¹ and could not have been blind to their drift. Even supposing that a Presbyterian system could not be established while Oliver lived, this would certainly have come after his death, for his sons had little sympathy with the sectaries. Henry Cromwell, in outlining to Thurloe those provisions in the Humble Petition and Advice that seemed to him most important, laid stress upon the religious plan, approving warmly the "holdeing forth a publique confession of faith (the expectation of these nations) injoyning the acknowledgment of the sacraments, prayer, magistracy, and ministry, to be ordinances of God, and all this with due respect to tender consciences."²

Parliament's purposes in regard to religion are clearly evidenced by several other events. Speaker Widdrington, in presenting the Humble Petition and Advice to the Protector, expressed clearly and frankly the object in view:

There are two extremities in state, concerning the causes of faith and religion, (that is to say) the permission of the exercise of more religions than one, which is a dangerous indulgence and toleration, and is not introduced by this government. . . . The other is the entering and sifting into men's consciences, when no overt scandal is given, . . . and which is desired to be provided against in this Frame.³

This view must have been sufficiently alarming to the extreme sectaries, yet that it correctly defined the position of Parliament is plain from the subsequent action of the House. Thus an act "for the better observation of the Lord's Day" compelled attendance at church under penalty of the forfeiture of two shillings six pence for non-attendance.⁴ This act was precisely similar to the acts under

¹ April 21, 1657, Stainer, *Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, 331.

² H. Cromwell to Thurloe, April 8, 1657, Thurloe, VI. 183.

³ Burton, *Diary*, I. 408, 409.

⁴ June 26, 1657, *Calendar of State Papers, Dom.*, 1657-1658, p. 11.

Elizabeth and the Stuarts which had been objected to so bitterly by the Puritans. More significant still was the passage of a bill for catechizing.¹ It is impossible to say what this bill contained, but it was opposed by the more liberal and tolerant members of Parliament.² That it was an essentially anti-Independent bill can be inferred with certainty not only from this opposition, but also from Cromwell's position towards it and from the feeling his course aroused. It was the only bill that he vetoed, and this act bitterly incensed its supporters.³

The feeling of the sectaries in regard to the new religious settlement was clearly expressed in the *Narrative of the Late Parliament*, wherein the author caustically criticizes the settlement, and as a proof of the designs of the Parliament points to the bill for catechizing.⁴ It is not surprising that these various alarming events convinced the sectaries that a movement was being made to suppress them, and that Oliver was party to it. Many of them had been convinced of this as early as August, 1655, a conviction expressed in a well-known pamphlet directed against the Protector.⁵ Libelous as this pamphlet was, in so far as Cromwell's intentions were concerned, it was nevertheless a truthful statement of the direction that events were bound to take. The realization of their fears by the passage of the Humble Petition and Advice—this attempt to establish a national church and to shut out from the benefits of public maintenance all ministers who did not conform to its Confession of Faith—explains and justifies the opposition of the sectaries not only to the project of kingship but to the whole constitution.⁶

That the Humble Petition and Advice was left imperfect in many particulars might be inferred from the speed with which it was made and from the necessity of compromising the differences be-

¹ *Commons' Journals*, VII. 537, 551.

² Burton, II. 202, 203.

³ *Ibid.*, 205, 206; *Commons' Journals*, III. 551-553.

⁴ *Harleian Miscellany* (edition of 1745), III. 445.

⁵ *A Short Discovery of his Highness the Lord Protector's Intentions Touching the Anabaptists in the Army, and all such as are against his reforming things in the Church*, August 20, 1655, Thomason Tracts, E. 852. The writer charges Cromwell with the intention of setting up a state church and overthrowing the Anabaptists.

⁶ The attempt to establish a national church did not cease with the overthrow of the monarchists in 1657. In the second session of the Parliament, on January 21, 1657/8, Mr. Gwen moved for "a convocation or assembly of divines." The motion was discussed but came to nothing. Burton, II. 333-336. In Cromwell's speech of January 25 he speaks against the sects. Stainer, 377-379. See also *ibid.*, 387. On January 27, preaching before Parliament, the Reverend Mr. Griffith in his sermon spoke "for church government, but against imposing spirits; and it tasted a little of Court holy water." Burton, II. 373.

tween parties with regard to it.¹ The imperfection of the constitution was made irretrievable by the alteration of the title from king to protector. Incomplete and imperfect as the Petition might be, the acceptance of the office and title of king would have carried with it so many consequences, would have reestablished so many old legal institutions, that all defects would probably have been surmounted. But the lawyers were certainly correct in arguing that the laws could not be administered without the kingly office. They were correct because the mere conviction on their part was sufficient to make it impossible to administer the laws without the office. Furthermore, the protectoral office, since it had been conferred without a specific definition of its powers, left matters still unsettled. Moreover, since the proposal to grant to the protector precisely the same prerogatives as those inhering in the royal title had been rejected, only one conclusion could be drawn, namely, that the powers of the protector were not those of the king. What they were no man could tell. The consequences would be confusion in the interpretation of the law, contradictory decisions by the courts, and endless and hopeless endeavors to fit the new executive to the old institutions.

The failure to establish the kingship was of vast consequence in respect to the succession. The Petition permitted Cromwell to nominate his own successor, but made no provision for his successor's successor. Had he been king, the law would have determined all doubts. As things actually stood, the succession was left in almost as indefinite a condition as before the adoption of the new constitution.

More important still was the position assigned to the "other house" in the new scheme.² The judicial functions of the new house were defined in precise general terms, but its legislative functions were not. As matters stood, this was a prime defect. When Parliament framed the Petition, it had expected to have a king, in which case the legislative status of the new house would have been *ipso facto* determined. As a House of Lords its legislative functions would have been precisely those of the old House of Peers. Under

¹ For the speed with which the Humble Petition and Advice was made see Packer, February 9, 1658/9, Burton, III. 161; Baynes, February 11, 1658/9, *ibid.*, 216. Article 15, with the title of king in it, was omitted from the printed text, no effort being made to supply the omission, so that in all printed copies the bewildered reader passes directly from the fourteenth to the sixteenth article. Lenthall on June 23, 1657, asserted that the Petition and Advice was "very imperfect yet" and that he regarded it as being merely an "embryo." *Ibid.*, II. 280.

² In the original Humble Petition and Advice the nominations of members of the "other house" were to be approved by the House of Commons. The Humble Additional Explanatory Petition and Advice, however, left the nominations wholly in the hands of the protector.

a protectorate this was certainly not self-evident. That the "other house" was in fact "inconsistent with this title" of protector was so clear that during the debates after Cromwell's refusal of kingship it was taken for granted, the proposal being made to give up the house as a matter of course if the title protector was adopted.¹ That this motion was not carried shows pretty clearly that kingship was not abandoned. That the advocates of monarchical government insisted on retaining the "other house" without further definition of its status, its authority, and its powers is equally good evidence of the purpose to hold to their course. If they had been willing permanently to surrender their wishes, the position of the new house could have been settled in the sense agreeable to the opposing party without much difficulty. Unless, however, the project for kingship was completely surrendered, it was impossible to define further the functions and powers of the "other house"; for if this had been attempted, the partizans of a commonwealth would have "ravelled into" the entire frame of government to some purpose, in all probability with consequences disastrous to the plan.² The "other house," just as it existed, was an inevitable result of Cromwell's declining the kingship; and in forcing this upon him the army leaders won a great victory. "How have they," wrote an angry Oliverian, "forced him (as *Aaron*) to make a Calfe like the Egyptian Ox, an other House instead of a House of Peers?"³ The victory consisted in erecting an institution which was not viable as it existed, which must be altered, which must lead either to a kingly settlement or to the undoing of what had already been accomplished towards such a settlement. It was not by chance, therefore, that the attack of the opposition in the second session was directed against the "other house." The vulnerable part of the new settlement lay there, and there also lay the most serious menace to the advocates of military rule, of sectarianism, of the Commonwealth.

How differently the various parties regarded the status of the new house is shown by all the available evidence. From the first the monarchists hesitated to admit that they were attempting to create a House of Lords. On the contrary they assured opponents

¹ Whether "such things" in the Petition, "as may be therein conceived inconsistent with this title, may not be expunged, as House of Lords and such like." News letter, May 15, 1657, *Clarke Papers*, III. 108.

² See on this difficulty Goodwin's motion, June 24, 1657, Burton, II. 300; Shapcott, *ibid.*, 298; Sydenham, *ibid.*, 299; Desborough, *ibid.*

³ *A Petitionary Epistle directed to the Lord Protector and People of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, to continue in Unity*. March 19, 1657/8, Thomson Tracts, E. 743. 7, p. 4.

of the measure that all they wished was a balance or check upon the House of Commons in order to preserve liberty of conscience. There was to be no restoration of the old Lords.¹ It was even argued that the new house would be a bar to the restoration of the old one.² The supporters of another house asserted too that it was necessary to have a second house with "judicial power," since it was doubtful if the House of Commons possessed such power, and since, even if it did, too much time would be consumed in considering "complaints from Courts of Justice and Equity."³ The "great reason" alleged, however, was "that Bills passed too hastily" in a single house, and without sufficient discussion.⁴

It is evident that the royalists did not dare openly to champion a House of Lords. Even as it was, they found much difficulty in securing the assent of their opponents to the establishment of a new house.⁵ At last, however, the latter yielded to the arguments adduced, coupled with the assurance that there was no intention of restoring the old peers. They were willing to have a second house, provided only it was not a House of Lords. Neville, one of the Commonwealth leaders, argued indeed in favor of a second house with this limitation;⁶ and the army, after the dissolution of the Rump, while declaring against a restoration of the peers, favored the erection of a senate to keep the Commons within bounds.⁷

The argument against a House of Lords was perfectly intelligible and extremely simple: if a House of Lords was established, the old nobility would inevitably be admitted; and if the old nobility were admitted, the restoration of the Stuarts was certain.⁸

The Petition failed also to define the manner in which nominations were to be made to the new house after Oliver's death. The grant of power to nominate members was to Oliver alone, without mention of his heirs and successors. It could be argued therefore that future protectors had no authority to nominate members. Had

¹ "Never was any thing brought in with more sugar-sweet and plausible words. It shall be a check upon restraint of liberty of conscience. There shall be no bringing in of the old nobility." Packer, Burton, III. 165. See also Sydenham, *ibid.*, II. 299; Cromwell's speech to the officers, February 28, 1656/7, Stainer, 263, 264.

² Burton, II. 413.

³ Colonel Matthews, February 4, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 451.

⁴ *Idem.*, *ibid.*

⁵ "The other house, or ballance goes heavily on." Sir John Reynolds to H. Cromwell, February 24, 1656/7, Lansdowne MS. 823, folio 90. "That, we feare, will most stick with us, is the ballance, or house of Lords as some call it; of wch we hope to see an yssue within 4 dayes." J. Bridges to H. Cromwell, March 3, 1656/7, Lansdowne MS. 821, folio 93. The "other house," Thurloe feared, would "prove a very hard and doubtfull question." Thurloe to H. Cromwell, March 8, 1656/7, Thurloe, VI. 93.

⁶ February 8, 1658/9, Burton, III. 134.

⁷ Firth, *Cromwell's Army*, 382.

⁸ Sydenham, June 24, 1657, Burton, II. 298.

the monarchy been reëstablished, this grant to Oliver alone could have created no legal difficulty, for a king is a corporation sole, and therefore his powers and prerogatives vest without interruption in his successor. In other words, the king never dies.

Another shortcoming of the Humble Petition and Advice was the failure to provide for the distribution of members of the lower house. The plan of reformed constituencies embodied in the Instrument of Government perished with the Instrument. It was probably unsatisfactory to the members, or they would have adopted it in the new constitution as it stood. The question of a new reformed distribution was discussed on May 27, 1657, but the House got no further than to pass a resolution that the subject should be finally debated in one week from that date.¹ But the predetermined day was later set apart as a day of thanksgiving for Blake's victory at Vera Cruz, and the discussion concerning distribution was never resumed. As a consequence the old unreformed constituencies revived.² Not only so, but the failure to determine the distribution of seats left the new constitution without a specific provision for electing members to Parliament from Scotland and Ireland.³

The question arises too whether Cromwell was really possessed of a veto under the new protectorate. He certainly believed that he was, for on one occasion he exercised a veto. Yet one may well doubt that the Petition and Advice granted this prerogative; and in Richard's Parliament the privilege was hotly questioned. If Cromwell had become king, the veto would have been his as part of the royal prerogative, but a protector as protector had no such prerogative, and the Humble Petition and Advice did not specifically confer it upon him.

In short, although the new constitution was an advance along the line which government in England was bound to take, though it restored the rights of the people and the privileges of Parliament, though it increased the powers of the houses and diminished those of the executive, it was astonishingly imperfect and could not possibly be a final settlement.

Under the circumstances it was of the utmost importance that the new government should be intrusted to those who desired its success. The principal opponents of kingship, with the exception

¹ *Ibid.*, 138, 139.

² That Cromwell believed the old system to be reëstablished may be inferred from the fact that in granting a charter to Swansea, May 3, 1658, he constituted it a parliamentary borough. *Dictionary of National Biography*, XXX. 152, article "Philip Jones."

³ Charges to H. Cromwell, June 22, 1658, Thurloe, VII. 193. See also in Burton the discussion over this point in Richard Cromwell's Parliament.

of Fleetwood, Desborough, and a few others, could certainly not be counted among this number. Changes in the form of government, as Henry Cromwell sagaciously pointed out, were of no avail so long as the same men remained in power. He therefore strongly advocated the purging of the council and the army. In other words, he wished the government to be intrusted to those whom he called "the honest party."¹

The Protector, however, had evidently resolved upon a compromise government, and was not inclined to purge either council or army. The only new councilors created were Thurloe, who received the dignity on July 13, 1657,² and the Protector's eldest son, Richard, who was made councilor at the request of the council in December of the same year.³ But the opposition of one man had been so venomous, and in the opinion of all so clearly factious and self-seeking, that he could not overlook it. The offender was John Lambert, and over him came the first struggle of parties in the new government. Lambert was throughout supported by Sydenham, another influential member of the council; and neither of the malcontents came near Whitehall for weeks after the final decision.⁴ Some believed that Lambert would either surrender his commission or have it taken from him. Thurloe was confident that he would not surrender it, and believed there would be serious danger in permitting him to retain his power. Others, however, presumably Fleetwood and Desborough, were of a different opinion.⁵ Henry Cromwell agreed with Thurloe. "I take notice of your opinion concerning [Lambert]," he wrote. "I hope H. H. is sufficiently cautioned concerning him, and I wish those, who think his continuance in power safe, doe not first feele the smarte of it."⁶ Lambert himself apparently began to suspect that he had overstepped the limits of his power. "My Lord Lambert lookes but sadly," wrote Russell. "He puts me in mind of a saying of old Solomons, that there is an appointed time for all things under the sun, to hate as well as to love, to be sad as well as merry."⁷ On July 13 the council was to be sworn, and Cromwell had already laid commands upon Lambert, probably to absent himself. "I doubt not," wrote Fleetwood on the fourteenth, "yu will heare his

¹ H. Cromwell to Broghill, February 17, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 811. See also H. Cromwell to Thurloe, and to Fauconberg, same date, *ibid.*, 810. He wished to see St. John and Pierrepont admitted to the council. Same to Thurloe, July 15, 1657, *ibid.*, 404.

² *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, 1657-1658, p. 26.

³ *Ibid.*, 206, 208, 239.

⁴ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, July 17, 1657, Thurloe, VI. 411, 412.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ H. Cromwell to Thurloe, July 15, 1657, *ibid.*, VI. 404.

⁷ Sir F. Russell to H. Cromwell, July 4, 1657, Lansdowne MS. 823, folio 145.

Highnes commands to my Lord Lambert. Such passages of providence are to be teachings to us."¹ Lambert, it was said, refused to take the oath imposed upon members of the council, and was removed as a consequence.² His commission was surrendered on July 23. Whether he refused to take the oath or not is uncertain; but if he did, he appears later to have expressed a willingness to comply. "I suppose," wrote Thurloe, "I writ your lordship, that . . . [Lambert] desired to serve in the counsell, and offered to take his oath; that is paused upon. He is now retired in appearance. Most of the officers of the army, and those most suspected, shew rather satisfaction then otherwise."³ Lambert's offer was not accepted.

The dismissal caused an immense sensation and convinced men that Oliver meant to be master and probably monarch. "All men expected," wrote Baillie, "that when so easily Lambert was quashed, the next session of Parliament would have quickly made Cromwell king."⁴ The act, however, remained an isolated one, Cromwell making no attempt to root out Lambert's adherents.

His monarchist followers, however, could not adopt a similar philosophical attitude, and it cannot be doubted that they still worked silently towards the wished-for goal. "The little secretary" might in the bitter moment of defeat avow his enduring faith in the considerableness of "simplicity," but he could not help pursuing the game; and he urged members to come up to the next session and complete the work. John Ashe wrote that he would strive to be present at the opening of the session, "that I may give my best assistance for the perfecting the happy settlement wch is soe much expected and desired by all those that love his Highnesse and the peace and safety of these nations."⁵ Lord Broghill, most pertinacious of kingmakers, saw no reason to despair. He remonstrated earnestly with Montague, who had announced an intention of retir-

¹ Fleetwood to H. Cromwell, July 14, 1657, Lansdowne MS. 821, folio 323.

² Stoepe to Marigny, August 10, 1657, Thurloe, VI. 427; J. R. to Colonel Whit-
ley, ^{July 24}
^{August 2}, 1657, *Cal. St. Papers, Dom.*, 1657-1658, p. 41; — to John Franklin,
^{July 23}
^{August 2}, 1657, *ibid.*, 40; *Third Report of the Hist. MSS. Commission*, 247. See an
interesting account by Bernardi of Lambert's dismissal, ^{July 20}
^{August 9}, 1657, in Prayer,
"Oliviero Cromwell dalla Battaglia di Worcester alla sua Morte," in *Atti della Società
Ligure di Storia Patria*, XVI. (Genoa, 1882) 438.

³ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, July 28, 1657, Thurloe, VI. 425. Lambert's name is
not mentioned by Thurloe, but there can be no doubt that it is he to whom reference is
made. The only other who could by any possibility be intended was Sydenham.
Sydenham, however, took the councilor's oath on July 21. *Cal. St. Papers, Dom.*,
1657-1658, p. 32.

⁴ Baillie to Spang, [June, 1658], Robert Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, III. 359.

⁵ John Ashe to Thurloe, December 28, 1657, Rawlinson MS. A. 56, folio 337.

ing. From this intention "I conclude," he wrote, "the game our mastere is to manage is either very desperate, that you give it over, or very certain, since you think it needs not your help." He ended by urging Montague to continue in public life for the good of the cause.¹ That he was intent upon attempting once more to make Oliver king may be inferred with certainty from a letter of Henry Cromwell's to him, written in February, 1658.²

The success or failure of such plans to establish monarchy would depend very largely upon the composition of the new house. If its members were monarchists, if they were men having the confidence of the nation, if they were to a considerable extent members of the old peerage, then the object aimed at by Broghill and his adherents might be attained. If, on the contrary, the new house was constituted for the most part of army men and antimonarchists, then the difficulty of creating a king would be immensely enhanced. But the importance of the new house did not cease here. Upon its success, one may confidently assert, depended the success or failure of the new government.

The vital importance of this question escaped no one, and the subject was discussed in all its phases. Despite the fact that the Humble Petition and Advice created the new dignities only for life, there were not wanting those who held that the new lordships would be hereditary. The writs to be issued would certainly create the recipients lords, asserted the supporters of monarchy. Philip Jones, writing to Montague, informed him that his "writt of the 20th of January" made him "a Baron as the learned lawers say, . . . but sure our Petetion and Advice makes it but for life."³ On the other side, it was said by those not so near to the springs of information that the judges had declared that no legal writ creating barons could be issued until Cromwell became king.⁴ This was probably the opinion of the majority of the lawyers. Prynne, who

¹ Broghill to Montague, November 20, 1657, Thurloe, VI. 622.

² "As for the reviving, etc., I am really at my wit's ends. You cannot but imagine, that too near concernment, and my imperfect knowledge of affairs, make me incapable of advising any thing hereupon. But I rely upon your lordship's wisdom and integrity herein, and shall earnestly beseech the Lord to encrease it upon this most difficult attempt of your lordship." H. Cromwell to Broghill, [February, 1657/8], *ibid.*, 790.

³ Philip Jones to Montague, December 22, 1657, Carte MS. 73, folio 125.

⁴ "The Judges being lately required by his Highnesse to make the forme of writt whereby the intended members of the other House might be called to sit in parliament, their answer was that until his Highness did accept of the title of King noe legall writs could be made, nor house of Peeres constituted." News-letter, November 17, 1657, *Clarke Papers*, III. 127.

"They may not take their new honors till Cromwell has assumed the title of King, . . ." T. Mompesson to [Secretary Nicholas], January 4, 1657/8, *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, 1657-1658, p. 255.

could not long remain silent, busied himself with a new edition of his treatise *A Plea for the Lords and House of Peers*, wherein he argued that all the old nobility had an undoubted right to sit in Parliament, and that all the judicial powers of Parliament were vested in the king and the House of Lords.¹

In this state of affairs it was of prime importance that the men who were to compose the new house should be selected with the utmost skill and wisdom. The task of selection, however, was no small one, the difficulty proving "great between those, who are fitt and not willinge to serve, and those who are willinge, and expect it, and are not fitt."² "I doubt," wrote Montague with gloomy forebodings, "divers whom I could (and I beleewe yr Lo^{ps} also) wish were of it will not middle, and noe doubt divers others will readily supply theire places. I heartily wish it otherwise."³ Undoubtedly Montague's chief doubts were in relation to the old nobility, and here he was justified. It is conceivable that the peers summoned would have been willing to sit had the summons come from a king. It can hardly be doubted, too, that many more of them would have been summoned if Oliver had been king instead of protector. As it was, the old peers, even those friendly to Cromwell, would not answer his summons.⁴ Even the Scotch lords would not sit. Only Warriston and Lockhart represented Scotland; "Cassilis disdained it."⁵ As might be expected, those men who had most strongly supported the new kingship were also unwilling to take part. For instance, Pierrepont and St. John were nominated, but did not sit.

Under these circumstances Oliver did the best he could. He was of course bound to compromise, and consequently selected men of all parties. Had he been bent upon becoming king, this would hardly have happened. The choice of Hazelrigg seems almost ludicrous; the selection of Pride and a score of the keenest opponents of the kingship must have seemed folly to men like Thurloe. Oliver, it is true, consulted representatives of all parties:

¹ Prynne's treatise, *A Plea for the Lords and House of Peers* (London, May, 1658), first published in 1647, now in a "much augmented" form (518 pages) on account of the "late loud unexpected Votes at Westminster of, a New King and House of Lords, under the Name, Notion of Another House." Thomason Tracts, E. 751.

² Thurloe to H. Cromwell, December 1, 1657, Thurloe, VI. 648.

³ Montague to H. Cromwell, December 5, 1657, Lansdowne MS. 822, folio 295.

⁴ Not even the Earl of Warwick, with whom he was connected by marriage. For this attitude of the old peers see the letter of Lord Say and Sele to Lord Wharton, December 29, 1657, *English Historical Review*, X. 106, 107. Only one member of the old peerage sat.

⁵ Baillie to Spang, [June, 1658], Baillie, III. 359.

Montague,¹ his council,² Pierrepont,³ and probably all of his close friends of both factions. Naturally, after puzzling over the matter for weeks he ended by dissatisfying everybody. On December 8 Thurloe wrote in evident disgust, "I begin to guesse who they are like to be; and I am content your excellencye should receive them by any other hand."⁴ In January Henry Cromwell wrote sadly to Broghill, "If you had been there time enough, your lordship might have been carpenter of a better house."⁵ When finally the selection was made, Thurloe was so exasperated that he apparently neglected of set purpose to send the list to Henry Cromwell.⁶ His indignation was undoubtedly occasioned by the conviction that the new house would prove itself an insurmountable obstacle to the erection of a monarchy.

Most people felt that if the old lords honored the new house by their presence, it would be enormously strengthened and might succeed. Their attitude, therefore, was scrutinized closely by all parties. "Some say the lords Warwick, Manchester, Wharton and others are not inclined to sitt," wrote Needham on January 7.⁷ "Some of our other howse, it seemes," wrote Fleetwood, "have not a minde to sitt with us, upon the account of the hereditary peerage";⁸ and Thomas Fox on January 23 notes that "Not any of the old Lords come in yet."⁹ The lords did not come, and the failure gave a weapon to the opposition of which they availed themselves. They would not recognize the new house as a House of Peers, and laid particular emphasis upon the fact that the old nobility did not appear there.¹⁰

The new government was therefore foredoomed to failure, and this failure was made absolutely certain and irretrievable by the composition of the House of Commons. The Cromwellians there, weakened by the transfer of many of their ablest men to the other house, and still further by the admission of the formerly

¹ "My oportunityes wth his Highnesse are not manye nor is my judgement fitt to advise him but I have not spared to speake as occation hath beene offered unto mee." Montague to H. Cromwell, December 5, 1657, Lansdowne MS. 822, folio 295.

² *Clarke Papers*, III. 127; Thurloe, VI. 630; Fleetwood to H. Cromwell, November 24, [1657], *ibid.*, 631.

³ H. Cromwell to Thurloe, November 25, 1657, *ibid.*, 633.

⁴ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, December 8, 1657, *ibid.*, 665.

⁵ H. Cromwell to Broghill, January 13, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 745.

⁶ H. Cromwell to Broghill, *ibid.*

⁷ Needham to Swift, January 7, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 734.

⁸ Fleetwood to H. Cromwell, January 16, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 752.

⁹ Thomas Fox, January 23, 1657/8, Stowe MS. 185, folio 123.

¹⁰ "Scrupling to owne all of them as Lords, especially seing the Earles of Warwick, Mulgrave and Manchester the Lo: Wharton and Lo: Say did not appeare there." Letter to Lord Wharton, January 27, 1657/8, Carte MS. 103, folio 86.

excluded members, had no strength to resist the attacks of their opponents.

Cromwell foresaw none of the difficulties, and opened the second session of his Parliament in good spirits, being perhaps the one man who had complete confidence in the new frame of government. "We hope we may say," he exclaimed, "we have arrived at what is much beyond our expectations." The Petition and Advice had restored to the nation both its civil and its religious liberties, and for that he was sure they had "all cause to bless God."¹ By implication he avowed the new house to be a house of peers, addressing the assembled houses as "my Lords, and Gentlemen of the House of Commons," and speaking of the protest of the bishops against laws "made by this House and the House of Commons."² He urged them in conclusion to be "the repairers of breaches, and the restorers of paths to dwell in."³

The opposition in the House of Commons, however, was not anxious to repair breaches. On the contrary, it assaulted the Humble Petition and Advice by refusing to acknowledge the other house as a House of Lords. Day after day the question of the powers of the "other house" was debated, and "confusion worse confounded" held sway. On January 25 Cromwell appealed to the houses to go forward in the important work which lay before them, solemnly asserting, "I conceive the well-being, yea the being of these nations is now at stake." He then pointed out the political situation and its dangers at home and abroad, attempting especially to arouse feeling for the condition of Protestants on the continent. Concluding this head, he spoke strongly and with a direct appeal concerning the religious and political divisions at home, urging the houses "to uphold this settlement, which I have no cause to think but you are agreed to and that you like it." Over and over again in the most solemn language he adjured them to preserve peace and amity.

We have peace and the Gospel. Let us have one heart and soul, one mind to maintain the honest and just rights of this nation, . . . I beseech you and charge you in the name and presence of God, and as before him, be sensible of these things and lay them to heart. . . . If God shall [not] unite your hearts and bless you, and give you the blessing of union and love one to another, and tread down everything that riseth up in your hearts or tendeth to deceive your own souls with pretences of this and that thing that we speak of, and [if you do] not prefer the keeping of peace, that we may see the fruits of righteousness in them that love peace and embrace peace, it will be said of this poor nation, *Actum est de Anglia*.⁴

¹ Speech of January 20, 1657/8, Stainer, 357-359.

² *Ibid.*, 362.

³ *Ibid.*, 365.

⁴ Speech of January 25, 1657/8, Stainer, 365-387.

It was in vain, however. The republicans were resolved to set all in confusion, and they were at this very moment immensely strengthened by the accession of Lambert and Hazelrigg. These two appeared in the House for the first time on January 25,¹ and Hazelrigg immediately took the leadership of the republican party. On the other hand, Oliver seemed determined to have the "other house" recognized as a House of Lords. Neither side would yield in the slightest degree. Oliver's insistence apparently precipitated the crisis. On January 28, in answer to a committee of the House of Commons, which requested directions concerning the printing of his speech of the twenty-fifth, he refused bluntly to give such directions, on the ground that such action might be a breach of the privileges of the other house. He gave the committee distinctly to understand that the other house must be recognized as a House of Lords if he and Parliament were to agree.² After this, compromise was impossible.

Despite the hopelessness of the situation, the effort to make Cromwell king was resumed. On January 28 Major Beake and Colonel Shapcott moved to debate the title of Protector, and the status of the "other house."³ On February 2 Sir John Trevor moved a return to the old constitution with kings, lords,⁴ and commons. On the following day Mr. Gewen moved that kingship should be reestablished,⁵ and was supported by Colonel Cox.⁶ There was no heart, however, in this renewal of the old attempt. The leaders of the monarchists remained silent, and indeed it was perfectly plain that for the present nothing of the sort could succeed.

In short, the situation was absolutely desperate. "I am amazed at proceedings," wrote Henry Cromwell, "and have a kind of dread in considering them."⁷ On the same day he appealed to Fleetwood "to incline to what is rational and consistent . . . to seek the peace of these distressed and distempered nations."⁸ There was certainly cause for amazement and dread, for the antimonarchists had struck upon a bold — one may say a seditious — plan to

¹ Fauconberg to Lockhart, ^{January 25} ^{February 4} 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 757. Hazelrigg's action was all the more significant because he had been nominated to the upper house.

² Speech of January 28, 1657/8, Stainer, 387, 388. "I say the House of Lords," Burton, II. 380. "His Highness has resolved to have it by that title." Bodurda, February 4, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 442.

³ *Ibid.*, 377 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 412.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 424.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 437.

⁷ H. Cromwell to Broghill, February 3, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 775.

⁸ He adds, "I need not tell you the effects of a breach, of a new unsettlement at this time, when our wants are so very great." H. Cromwell to Fleetwood, February 3, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 774.

restore the Commonwealth by a union between the disaffected part of the army, the sectaries, and the opposition in Parliament.¹ The movement culminated in the drawing of a petition to Parliament, praying for the restoration of the Commonwealth. The principal points aimed at were (1) to secure to the people "the constant succession of Free Parliaments duely chosen," and (2) to secure the "unquestioned Supreme Power to the said Parliaments."² This petition was openly circulated, some fifty copies being printed for the purpose, and it was signed by many thousands of people in and about London.³ The leading actor in its promulgation was apparently John Weaver, a noted Commonwealth's-man, who with several of his party "made it their buisnesse to perswade to a commonwealth, and were confident, that they should carry it; and the petition . . . was to be the first occasion for the debate of it in the house; and a cheife man of them useinge arguments to another very considerable person to engage with them for the old parliament, and being answered, that it was impossible, because the army was against it, he replyed, that he would take it upon him, that the army would declare for it, and that he knew they had beene tryed in

¹ "About which time also, a Petition was preparing, by some faithfull Friends to the good old Cause, in, and about the City of London, which was afterward printed, and signed with many thousand Hands; which Petition makes Mention of the severall Particulars that were the Grounds of Contest between the late King, and Parliament, and the good people of the Nation. And prayeth, 'The Settling those good Things fought for, as the Reward and Fruit of the Blood and Treasure so greatly expended in the late Wars, etc.' This Petition was ready to be presented to the Parliament, in a peaceable Way, by the Hands of about Twenty in the name of the rest, desiring to submit the Issue thereof to God, and the Wisdom of that Assembly." *A Second Narrative of the late Parliament (so called) in Harleian Miscellany* (edition of 1745), III. 450.

² The following is an abstract of the petition: Objects. (1) to secure to the people (a) "the constant succession of Free Parliaments duely chosen," and (b) "unquestioned supreme power to the said Parliaments"; (2) the militia to be settled, and people and Parliaments protected against improper use of said militia; (3) no money to be levied without consent of Parliament"; (4) (a) that "the peoples persons and Estates may be onely subject to be disposed of according to the Laws of the Land," and (b) "speedy consideration had of the long Imprisonment of many persons well-affected . . . without any due prosecution"; (5) officers and soldiers not to "be turned out of their respective imployments without a legall Triall at a Court-Martial." *A True Copy of a Petition Signed by very many Peaceable and Well-affected People, Inhabiting in and about the City of London, and intended to have been delivered to the late Parliament*, Thomason Tracts, E, 743:5, March 11, 1657/8.

³ "The Petitioners did not carry on their busnesse in a secret underhand way, but openly; . . . and the Petition being framed and agreed unto, . . . about 50 copies were printed and dispersed in order to Subscription, and in a few dayes (notwithstanding many frowns from Grandees, and a numerous Army then quartered in and about the City to the terrour of very many) it was signed by many thousands, and ready to have been presented by a few (under a score) in the name of the rest." *Ibid.* The similarity of the language here and in the *Second Narrative*, where this matter is treated, would lead to the supposition that either the writers were the same, or the author of the *Narrative* had this pamphlet before him when he wrote.

it."¹ According to Bordeaux the petition was largely the result of the bitter opposition of the sectarian clergymen, who "excited" the Commonwealth's-men to present the petition, and "spake high and openly against the government of his highness."² That the movement was wide-spread may be safely asserted. The commander of the garrison at Hull wrote Cromwell that his opponents there "were very high before the desolution of Parliament, haveing undoubtedly a dangerous designe in agitation."³

No movement so serious for Cromwell's régime had hitherto been started. The Cavaliers, Fifth Monarchy Men, and the Commonwealth's-men had opposed him persistently and bitterly, but without securing much support. The attempt to erect a kingship, however, had consolidated the Commonwealth party, had driven many men hitherto friendly to Oliver into its ranks, and for a moment had united all opponents excepting only the Cavaliers. The boldness of the petition for the overthrow of the government went far beyond anything hitherto conceived, yet undoubtedly the petition itself was the direct result of the officers' petition of May, 1657. If the army could petition unrebuked for a certain form of government, why might not the supporters of a commonwealth do likewise?

The immediate result was the dissolution of Parliament.⁴ Cromwell, to the surprise of everyone, in a rage summoned the two houses, and arraigned the Commons in a speech which revealed the bitterness of his soul, and his conviction that the new settlement had fallen in ruins. "I looked," he said, "that the same men that had made that frame would have made it good to me when I came to act your Petition and Advice." Otherwise he would have preferred to live "under a woodside to have kept a flock of sheep, rather than to have undertaken such a place as this was." But he had taken it only because he had expected settlement, and "the safety of the nations," as was well known to "all that did advise and petition . . . and I am failed in these terms." They had refused to

¹ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, July 13, 1658, Thurloe, VII. 269; Bordeaux to Mazarin, February 4, 1657/8, *ibid.*, VI. 778; Bordeaux to Brienne, February 4, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 779. Bordeaux here agrees with Thurloe in the general facts.

² Bordeaux to Mazarin, February 4, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 778.

³ C. H. Smith to Oliver Cromwell, February 11, 1657/8, Rawl. MS. A. 57, folio 312.

⁴ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, July 13, 1658, Thurloe, VII. 269; *Second Narrative, Harleian Miscellany* (edition of 1745), III. 450; J. Berners to E. H., *Eng. Hist. Review*, VII. 106, 107; Bordeaux to Mazarin, February 4, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 778; Ludlow (Firth's edition), II. 33; Bernardi, ^{February 22,} ^{March 4,} 1657/8, Prayer, 469; Payne to Nieupoort, February 5, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 781. For the surprise which Cromwell's act gave, even to his council, see Fauconberg to H. Cromwell, February 9, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 788; H. Cromwell to Lord Broghill, February 17, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 811.

recognize the "other house"; they had refused to carry out the new government in accordance with their oaths. Had they settled that government, "not to make hereditary Lords nor to make hereditary King or Kings — ye had had a basis to stand upon," and "if there was an intention of settlement you would have settled upon this [basis] to have altered or allayed. . . . But this hath not ben done, it hath not. . . . Instead a new business hath been seeking in the room of this, this actual settlement, settlement by your consent . . . really, designing a Commonwealth, that some tribune of the people might be the man that might rule all. This hath been the business really. I am sorry to say it, but I think the meanest people that go about the streets take notice of it. This is the business; but is this all? They have engaged, or persuaded others to engage to carry that thing on; . . . We have known these things have been designed, we have known attempts have been made in the Army to seduce them, and almost the greatest confidence hath been in the Army to break us and divide us. . . ." There were endeavors, too, "from some not far from this place to stir up the people of this town into tumultings, what if I said rebellion. . . . Yea, and to draw the Army to the state of a question, a Commonwealth, a Commonwealth." These things being so, "I do declare to you here, that I do dissolve this Parliament. Let God judge between you and me."¹

So ended in complete failure the attempt to settle the government under the Humble Petition and Advice. That it was failure was everywhere recognized. The writer of the *Second Narrative* jubilantly asserted that had Parliament continued to sit, it might have "overvoted the Lovers of Freedom, and so have perfected their Instrument of Bondage, and rivetted it on the Necks of the good People for ever by a Law, and thereby made them Vassals and Slaves perpetually. But hitherto the Lord hath, in a great measure, frustrated their wicked Designs, blessed be his holy name."²

The part which the failure to define clearly the status and functions of the "other house" had played in this unexpected outcome was obvious to all. Josias Berners, writing to his cousin John Hobart, a steady and thorough supporter of the kingship, upbraided the monarchists for their neglect. It was a wonder, he asserted, that wise men should have spent so much time upon a title, a matter "merely extrinsicall," while neglecting to build the main structure, a house of lords, upon a sure foundation. "See," he ex-

¹ Stainer, 388-397. The "Amen episode," so well known, is vouched for in the Philips manuscript, printed in the *Old Parliamentary History*; in the Clarke manuscript, Stainer, 483; and by Baillie to Spang, [June, 1658], Baillie, III. 360.

² *A Second Narrative, Harleian Miscellany* (edition of 1745), III. 452.

claimed, "howe many badd consequences doe, and hereafter must follow."¹ Friends of the project for kingship and a restored House of Lords hoped that "the vanity of Messages and Messengers during the last fortnight's sitting" would free them forever from half-hearted expedients which could never provide settlement.² Undoubtedly the criticism was to the point, but nevertheless the monarchists were not to be upbraided with neglect, for, as has already been pointed out, they had done the best that they could. Their blamelessness, however, could not save the situation. The "other house" could hardly hope to recover from its colossal failure, totally disowned as it had been by almost everyone concerned.³

There were many conjectures as to what Oliver would do next, but the prevailing opinion seems to have been that he would call a "great council," which should "manage the affairs of the nation."⁴ It is quite possible that this expedient was suggested. Before anything final could be done, however, the government had to be certain that its existence was for the present assured. Oliver's first step, therefore, was to appeal to the army and to the city for support. On February 6 he addressed the officers at Whitehall, urging those who could not "in conscience conform to the now government" to speak out, and expressing the hope that they would still be able to go along together as in the past. The officers declared themselves satisfied and promised their support.⁵ So, too, the city officials, when appealed to, renewed their pledges of fidelity and

¹ Josias Berners (?) to John Hobart, no date, no signature, Tanner MS. 51, folio 3.

² *A Petitionary Epistle directed to the Lord Protector and People of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, to Continue in Unity*, March 19, 1657/8, Thomason Tracts, E. 743, 7, p. 4.

³ There was much pertinency in the description of the situation as sketched by an opponent of the "other house" in 1658:

"The *other House* constituted by it, when summoned, was totally disowned 1 — By the Commons themselves who created it by this *Petition and Advice*; yet would not acknowledge, but disclaimed it when erected; And if these *Creators* would not own this their *mungrell ill compacted new creature*, there is no probability, that any future Knights, Citizens, or Burgesses will approve or submit unto it: 2ly, By the *antient Peers*, and most *Gentlemen of Estate and Interest* summoned to this *other House*, who refused to sit, or own it at the first, upon such terms as will engage them to disown it for the future, and not to appear therein though summoned. 3ly, By the generality of the people, who disrelished, and made no adresses to it upon any occasion. 4ly, This *House* and last Convention were thereupon suddenly dissolved by him that called and constituted them, as seeing no hopes nor possibilities of reconciling or uniting them; Therefore none else can possibly hope to peece or unite them in any New Convention summoned according to this *Petition and Advice*." *A Probable Expedient for present and future Publique Settlement*, November, 1658, Thomason Tracts, E. 766, 4, p. 2.

⁴ Bordeaux to Mazarin, February 14, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 778. Hartlib wrote to Pell to the same effect.

⁵ Stainer, 398. See also his notes on this speech.

aid.¹ Late in March the assurances of the officers of the English army took form in an address signed by 224 of them.² In this they assured Cromwell that "notwithstanding the base Calumnies and Lies . . . dispersed throughout the whole Nation" to the effect that the army was divided, and disaffected to the Protector, they remained "firmly united one to another, and all of us to your Highnesse, as our Generall and Chief Magistrate." They made it their "earnest and humble request" that he would continue the work of settlement until they had attained "the great ends of all our former engagements, our civill and spirituall liberty." These ends, they were confident, were "already in a good measure well provided for, by *The Humble Petition and advice*." They did "freely and heartily engage" to support the Protector with their lives in the "further prosecution of the great work" upon which he was engaged.³ It is plain from the contents of this petition and from the signatures attached to it that Cromwell had nothing to fear from his army; and this was Thurloe's conviction even before the address was presented.⁴ Equally reassuring were the addresses from the armies in Scotland and Ireland. The Irish army, in fact, went even further than the English in their pledges of allegiance to the Protector in his government.⁵

Nevertheless, the army was far from being satisfied throughout. Major Lowe, in Ireland, for instance, refused to sign the address of

¹ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, March 16, 1657/8, Thurloe, VII. 4; *Mercurius Politicus*, March 17-24, 1657/8. See Oliver's speeches to the Mayor, etc., in Stainer, 398-401. Addresses of the Commissioners for the city militia and the Colonels of the train bands, in *Mercurius Politicus*, April 17-24, 1658.

² H. W. to —, March 25, 1658, *Clarke Papers*, III. 144.

³ *A Further Narrative of the Passages of these times in the Common-Wealth of England*, printed by M. S. for Thomas Jenner, 50, 51. The date of the petition is March 27, 1658.

⁴ Thurloe to Lockhart, March 11²¹, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 863; to Downing, March 12²², 1657/8, *ibid.*, 871; to Lockhart, March 13²³, 1657/8, *ibid.*, VII. 3; to H. Cromwell, March 16²⁶, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 4.

⁵ See H. W.'s news-letter, March 25, 1658, *Clarke Papers*, III. 143-145; officers of Colonel Wilks's and Colonel Fairfax's regiments, Dalkeith, February 27, 1657/8, *Mercurius Politicus*, No. 406, pp. 373-374; officers of Colonel Talbot's and Lord General Monk's regiments, Dalkeith, March 3, 1657/8, *Public Intelligencer*, No. 115, p. 379; officers of Colonel Read's regiment, *Mercurius Politicus*, No. 407, p. 384; officers of Colonel Mitchel's regiment, Dundee, March 8, 1657/8, *Public Intelligencer*, No. 116, p. 396; officers of Colonel Robert Lilburne's regiment, *Mercurius Politicus*, No. 409, p. 415; "Officers of your Highness Army," presented by Lord Charles Fleetwood, March 27, 1658, *ibid.*, 419; officers of Colonel Ralph Cobbet's regiment, *Public Intelligencer*, No. 118, p. 415; Major-General Thomas Morgan and the commissioned officers of the forces in Flanders, April 4, 1658, *ibid.*, p. 428; garrison of Inverlochy, *Mercurius Politicus*, No. 410, p. 431; Major-General Morgan and regiment in Scotland, *ibid.*, No. 411, p. 455; Colonel Francis Hacker and regiment in Scotland, *ibid.*, p. 461; from the army in Ireland, *Public Intelligencer*, June 14-21, 1658, No. 130, p. 613.

the army there because a clause therein seemed to him clearly to urge kingly government.¹ The officers of Cromwell's own regiment, all Anabaptists, were most recalcitrant, and declared themselves not "free" to subscribe fully to the address of the English army. Cromwell reasoned with them, and finding them to assert steadfastly that they would adhere to "the good old cause," requested them to define that "cause," and to mention "one particular, wherein he had departed from it," at the same time telling them what he thought the cause was. Despite repeated requests for clearer declarations, however, the officers would not attempt any such definition. Only it was plain that the present government did not square with their conception of "the good old cause." The real difficulty, Colonel Packer afterwards declared, was their unwillingness to acknowledge the "other house"; "they could not say that was a House of Lords."² Failing to get satisfaction from them, Cromwell dismissed the six principal officers of the regiment;³ and having thus made a beginning, he continued to cashier ill-affected officers. All those "through the nation" who were "abettors of a late petition" for the Commonwealth were ousted,⁴ "Many in the army," says Baillie, "both in Scotland and England, are cast out."⁵ Clearly Oliver intended that no backward step should be taken. While the Protectorate stood, allegiance must be given to it, as well in the army as out of it. Not less obvious is it that all this cashiering tended to encourage the civil-government party and renew the hope that Cromwell would be king.

Kingship was probably now the only solution for the difficulties which beset the government, and it was generally expected. A new Parliament, it was said, would be called, but a Parliament including the old lords, and the Commons elected by the old constituencies.⁶ Whether the old lords were to be summoned or not

¹ H. Cromwell to Thurloe, March 24, 1657/8, Thurloe, VII. 21. H. Cromwell promptly dismissed Lowe from the army. H. Cromwell to Colonel Cooper, May 19, 1658, *ibid.*, 142, 143.

² Burton, III. 165-166.

³ Thurloe to Monk, February 12, 1657/8, *Clarke Papers*, III. 140; to Lockhart, February 11, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 793; and to H. Cromwell, February 16, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 806, 807, which gives the facts as here stated.

⁴ Wainwright to Bradshaw, February 19, 1657/8, *Sixth Report of the Hist. MSS. Commission*, 442. Wainwright speaks again of further cashiering in a letter of March 5, *ibid.*

⁵ Baillie to Spang, [June, 1658], Baillie, III. 360.

⁶ "You will have a Parliament called in short time of real Lords and Commons, according to the [—] will of the nation." Wainwright to Bradshaw, February 12, 1657/8, *Sixth Report of the Hist. MSS. Commission*, 442. Again on February 19, "shall have a Parliament once within nine months, called and constituted according to the ancient rights of the nation in the late King's time; . . . The ancient burroughs and cities their ancient number, and the Peers of the nation that have not forfeited their rights." *Ibid.*

it is impossible to say, but certainly the old unreformed system of elections to the Commons would prevail, since the Humble Petition and Advice had not adopted the reformed plan embodied in the Instrument. In any case Cromwell intended to have a new Parliament as soon as possible.

The question of calling a new Parliament came up immediately after the dissolution of the old one. Broghill wrote Henry Cromwell in February that another Parliament was in contemplation.¹ On February 23 Fleetwood wrote that Cromwell's illness was the reason for doing nothing at present.² On March 2 he again wrote that the question of settlement was being discussed, and that in his opinion they would "suddenly have a parliament." The question had been debated thoroughly. "All wayes" had "great difficultyes in them, but this the least, though full of intricacies."³ It is plain that Fleetwood favored a Parliament, but that others in the council strongly opposed it. Indeed, the question was so far from being settled at this time that Fleetwood added a postscript to his letter saying that "since the wrighting of the former lines" it had become doubtful which way they would take. In brief, the struggle between monarchists and antimonarchists still went on. The antimonarchists were opposed to having a Parliament and wished to raise means for carrying on the government by laying an extraordinary tax upon the Cavaliers.⁴ Unquestionably Desborough was the leader of this faction,⁵ though he was certainly not supported by Fleetwood.⁶ Until March 30 the discussion, according to Thurloe, was "tossed up and downe amongst comitees of severall sorts" and then had "at last come to the councill." The exact position of parties is well described by him: "They inclyne to a parliament, if they can agree what to aske the parliament, and what to submitt to, that shall be done by them and his highnes." Thurloe would give no opinion "because I see what some persons enclyne to, and what they thinke of a parliament and of such a way of settlement, as a parliament (if well-minded) may bringe forth."⁷ Two weeks later he wrote in a similar strain. There could be no doubt that a Parliament would be decided upon immediately, but

¹ "I am glad there is any hopes of another parliament." H. Cromwell to Broghill, February 24, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 820.

² Fleetwood to H. Cromwell, February 23, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 817.

³ Fleetwood to H. Cromwell, March 2, [1657/8], *ibid.*, 840.

⁴ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, March 30, 1658, *ibid.*, VII. 38.

⁵ H. Cromwell to Broghill, [February, 1658], *ibid.*, VI. 790; same to same, April 7, 1658, *ibid.*, VII. 56.

⁶ Same to same, March 24, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 21, 22; Fleetwood to H. Cromwell, April 27, 1658, *ibid.*, 100; same to same, May 24, 1658, *ibid.*, 144.

⁷ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, March 30, 1658, *ibid.*, 38.

for "the feares in some honest men, that they will settle us upon some foundations: and the doubts of some other, that if those feares still prevayle, and soe disappoint a settlement, that then a parliament will ruin us."¹ Here in a sentence he revealed the entire situation. It was kingship or ruin, from the point of view of Thurloe and Broghill; it was kingship and ruin, from the point of view of Desborough and Sydenham. Hence, the calling of a Parliament was not to be rashly adventured. Some agreement between the pros and cons must first be attained. Significant, however, is the readiness of Cromwell and his royalist supporters to summon a new Parliament, for it showed clearly their confidence that such a body would be with them, and that public opinion supported the proposal of kingship.²

It is evident that the opponents of kingship feared that a Parliament would make Cromwell king, and were determined to obstruct by every means in their power the calling of a Parliament. Not only so, but they were bent on suppressing the monarchists as far as possible. They wished to exclude Montague from the council and to hinder Fauconberg from receiving a commission in the army.³ In these circumstances the only policy for the royalists was precisely similar, namely, that of purging the army and council of their opponents. Henry Cromwell and undoubtedly Broghill were anxious to have this policy carried through. The former wrote:

The calling of a parliament signifys nothing, untill the army be sufficiently modelled; for that being full of its humours makes the honest party timorous, and the other insolent in their respective proposalls; . . . I say, the well-framing of the army would insensibly temper, and keep steady the parliament, which no doubt would provide well enough for a councill. The policy of those, who would keep out honest Montagu, etc. is not to be disallowed. I must say, I commend them for their witt; but think withall, that the over-ballancing of these politicians themselves is to be endeavoured; . . . We have ebbd and flowd long enough already. 'Tis now time, as your lordship says, that affairs should run one way or other in a quick current, and, if God so please, to settlement. The intimacy you mention of Fleetwood and Disbrowe with Lambert I do not like; for when such as they dare correspond with such as hee, it argues their power to be greater than one would wish, though I

¹ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, April 27, 1658, *ibid.*, 99.

² This confidence in Parliament is worth noting. It has often been said that Cromwell failed utterly with his Parliaments and could not get along with any. This was evidently not the opinion of Broghill, Thurloe, or Henry Cromwell. As the Parliament of 1656 had been more favorable to Oliver than that of 1654, so the next would probably be more favorable still. Much of this confidence was perhaps based on the fact that the next Parliament would be elected on the old basis. The result was seen in Richard's Parliament.

³ H. Cromwell to Broghill, March 10, 1657-8, Thurloe, VI. 858.

hope no greater then of all the rationall and interested men of the 3 nations, who, I am confident, will not comply with their designs.¹

The army was the instrument which needed mending first of all; and that must be done by the Protector. As already seen, Oliver had proceeded to some extent in that direction, though Henry Cromwell wished a much more thorough purging. Next in importance was the reform of the council, but if the army was once put on a proper footing, no doubt Parliament would rectify aught that was amiss in the council. The antimonarchical members should be ejected and monarchists taken in. Montague, Broghill, Pierrepont, St. John — these Henry would have taken in; Sydenham, Desborough, Fleetwood — these Henry would have cast out. Meanwhile Lambert was again becoming a factor in politics, and Fleetwood and Desborough were coquetting with him. Action, immediate and decisive, was necessary. No more compromises. "We have ebbed and flowed long enough already."

The discussion over the calling of a Parliament was continued through the first half of April, and was participated in by a council of the army.² By April 20 the civil-government party had so far overcome their opponents that the calling of a Parliament had been resolved upon, though the date of its summons and the nature of the business to be laid before it were still undetermined.³ The struggle between the contending factions was to be waged about this latter subject — or in other words, over the proposal to allow Parliament to proceed to any settlement it pleased. Such a settlement would probably mean kingly government.

This was the general opinion, and it must be obvious that the failure of the last Parliament had strengthened the determination of the monarchists to make Cromwell king. As early as February 24 Henry Cromwell wrote to Broghill, "I trust his highness will bring the army to such a state, as that there may be no danger of them, whilst his friends in parliament are hammering out our settlement."⁴ Further letters of Henry's written in April and May leave no doubt that he and Broghill were still of the opinion that kingship could

¹ H. Cromwell to Broghill, March 10, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 858. See also H. Cromwell to Thurloe, March 10, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 857.

² "The Privie Councill of his Highnesse, and another Councell of the army have been this weeke in debate of great business of calling a Parliament (which it's thought will sitt in May next), and likewise of a more future and more absolute settlement, then the Petition and Advice doth hold forth." G. M.'s News-letter, April 3, 1658, *Clarke Papers*, III. 145.

³ "K is resolved on: but when uncertain." Fauconberg to H. Cromwell, April 20, 1658, Thurloe, VII. 85. On the same day Thurloe wrote that Parliament would probably be summoned "very shortly." *Ibid.*, 84.

⁴ H. Cromwell to Broghill, February 24, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 820.

be attained.¹ The Irish army, probably influenced by Henry, petitioned that the Protector should go on to make "a thorough settlement of these our enjoyments; and that, upon such a Basis, as may be most firm in itself, and most suitable to the constitution of these nations."² The last phrase obviously pointed to kingship as the desirable basis. In Baillie's opinion the addresses of the armies in both Scotland and England also encouraged "the Protector to proceed," and it was thought, he added, that "on the councill's act and armie's petition, the Crown shall be put on." "Sundry shyres" were also "said to be forming petitions to his Highness to accept of the title of King."³ Without doubt, many of those who signed the army petitions must have done so in the expectation that kingship would be the outcome. As to the shires, certain petitions did appear in July and August, asking for settlement, with an evident reference to kingship as the government "most natural and acceptable to the nation."⁴

The need of settlement—a settlement that would compel the obedience of those inclined to royalty—was ominously emphasized by the prominence among the conspirators in the plot of 1658 of many young royalists who had hitherto shown themselves well-affected to the Protector and his government.⁵ This was a grave and most significant fact; for this younger generation, which had taken no active part in the quarrels of the past, should have known no allegiance excepting that to the established government. It was otherwise, however, and largely because these young men found themselves excluded from all participation in public affairs because they were members of Cavalier families; partly, too, no doubt, because of the severity with which the government of the major-generals had handled the Cavaliers. It was necessary to have a settlement that should strike at the sources of this disaffection.

¹ April 7, 1658, *ibid.*, VII. 56; April 14, 1658, *ibid.*, 72; [May?], 1658, *ibid.*, 115.

² *Public Intelligencer*, June 14–21, 1658.

³ Baillie to Spang, [June, 1658], Baillie, III. 360.

⁴ "V. That in your Highness life time such provision be made for the future Government of the Commonwealth, as may secure the interest of the good people of these Nations for succeeding Generations, That they may call you Blessed." Petition to Oliver of justices of peace, etc., of Nottingham, July 23, 1658, *Public Intelligencer*, August 9–16, 1658.

⁵ "And that your Highness would be pleased to enlarge our hopes of the continuance and increase of our present happines, by the further settlement and practice of that Government amongst us, which hath been found most natural and acceptable to this Nation, and is such as (administered by good hands) will we doubt not very much tend to the tranquility and felicity of this Commonwealth, your Highness and posterity." Petition from the grand jurors of the county of York, *Mercurius Politicus*, August 12–19, 1658.

⁶ "And they have enticed many young gentlemen, that were never before of their party." Thurloe to H. Cromwell, April 27, 1658, Thurloe, VII. 99. See also H. Cromwell's remarks on the young Cavaliers. To Thurloe, June 30, 1658, *ibid.*, 218.

It is a question of prime importance to determine Cromwell's attitude towards the renewal of the project of kingship. Bernardi asserted positively that Cromwell designed to be king;¹ and the author of the *Second Narrative* remarks that it "is reported" that though Cromwell refused the kingship, he "hath since repented his then Refusal."² That either of these individuals spoke with authority cannot be pretended, but certainly Cromwell had had reason to regret "his then refusal," and since he had once with much less provocation determined to accept kingship, one is surely justified in inferring that now he would willingly have become king. Moreover, if Broghill was to be believed, Cromwell had certainly concluded to accept the monarchical form of government. "I hope," wrote Henry Cromwell, "his highnes brave resolutions not to be cozened again will beget a serenity in your lordship's intentions."³ And in May he hoped that "his highnes's . . . promises that he will ratify and prepare the army for due compliance, etc." would encourage Broghill not to retire.⁴ It is clear from these quotations and from the general tone of Henry's letters that Broghill had asserted that Cromwell would "prepare the army for due compliance," in other words, that he was ready to assist in establishing the new monarchy.

That Cromwell was willing to accept such a settlement is also inferable from Thurloe's letters, as will be seen. That such a willingness would be apparent to the antimonarchists and that it would aggravate their opposition to kingship is self-evident. They had attempted to prevent the calling of a Parliament, and despite the resolution taken by the council that a Parliament should be summoned, they were still capable of delaying indefinitely the meeting of that body. The leaders of the republican faction in the council hit upon a bold expedient to thwart the monarchists. This was no less than the reconciliation of Cromwell with the leaders of the old Long Parliament. It was suggested that to this end Vane, Ludlow, and Rich should be taken into the council. Of course this plan contemplated a considerable return to the system of the Commonwealth, for no one could believe that such irreconcilables as these would ever consent to the protectoral government, not to speak of kingship. That they had been approached is certain, and that it was the antimonarchists who wished to call them into the council is also certain.⁵ Nothing, however, came of this effort at reconciliation.

¹ Bernardi, March $\frac{21}{31}$, 1658, Prayer, 475.

² *Second Narrative*, *Harleian Miscellany* (edition of 1745), III. 462.

³ H. Cromwell to Broghill, April 14, 1658, Thurloe, VII. 72.

⁴ H. Cromwell to Broghill, [May?], 1658, *ibid.*, 115.

⁵ "I am glad to hear of Ludlow, Rich, and also Sir Harry Vane's compliance," wrote Henry Cromwell. He doubted, however, the completeness of that compliance,

Progress in any direction seemed indeed to be impossible. "As for our owne affaires," wrote Thurloe, "they stand much at one staye: some discourses have beene this weeke about a settlement, and how to prepare for the comeinge of a parliament; but I doe assure your excellency, that I cannot finde the mindes of men soe disposed, as may give the nation the hopes of such a settlement as is wish'd for; and truly I thinke, that nothinge but some unexpected providence can remove the present difficulties."¹ This was on the first of June; and two weeks later Fleetwood wrote that "farther considerations of what is necessary as previous to the parliament" had been had, but "no resolution" had yet been reached.² Despairing of ever getting the matter determined by the council, Cromwell now appointed a committee of nine to settle it.³ Of course it was necessary to place members of both factions on this committee, and Cromwell would certainly never have dreamed of constituting it otherwise. The antimonarchists, however, had a majority, though two of their number were lukewarm in opposition. When Henry Cromwell was informed of the constitution of this new body, he spoke with bitter scorn and contempt of the new body and of the effort to reach settlement through its mediation.⁴ His contempt was justified, for after several weeks of debate on the question of settlement the majority "voted that succession in the government was indifferent," it might well be either by election or hereditary. This colorless conclusion was, of course, satisfactory to no one; and several of the antimonarchists insisted upon the

and added, "Neither do I think, that your affairs will gain much reputation by their being in your councill." He continues: "Is it not also a matter worth observation, who are the men, that are most industrious to call in such help? May it not be a design to obstruct and clog the business, when no other way is left to hinder your settlement, or cover their own disaffection? . . . He, that runs along with you, may more easily trip up the heels, than he, that wrestles with you; but my jealousy is easily appeased, when you say his highness hath an opportunity in his hands to settle." H. Cromwell to Thurloe, June 2, 1658, *ibid.*, 154, 155.

¹ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, June 1, 1658, *ibid.*, 153.

² Fleetwood to H. Cromwell, June 15, 1658, *ibid.*, 176. Fleetwood expected Parliament to meet in September.

³ "There are 9 in number, who dayly meet for consideringe of what is fitt to be done in the next parliament. . . . The 9 are lord Fiennes, lord Fleetwood, lord Desbrow, lord Chamberlayne, lord Whalley, Mr. comptroller, lord Goffe, lord Cooper, and Your Excellency's

Most humble and faithfull servant

Jo. Thurloe."

Thurloe to H. Cromwell, June 22, 1658, *ibid.*, 192. See also Philips's remarks upon this junto and Cromwell's balancing of parties on it, in his *Continuation of Baker's Chronicle* (ed. 1674), 652.

⁴ "The wise men were but 7. It seems you have made them 9; and having heard their names, I think myself better able to guess what they'll do, then a much wiser man; for no very wise man can ever imagine it." H. Cromwell to Thurloe, June 30, 1658, Thurloe, VII. 218.

desirability of the elective method as specified in the Humble Petition and Advice, "that is, that the chiefe magistrate should alwayes name his successor, . . . and I feare the word *desirable* will be made necessary, if ever it come upon the tryall,"¹ complained Thurloe. The question of the succession was evidently still the kernel of the whole problem. Of course, if succession was to be hereditary, the protectorate was in all essentials a monarchy.

Cromwell's position is pretty clearly determinable by his reception of the committee's report. He discharged them from further consideration of the matter, and declared that he would "take his own resolutions," that he could no "longer satisfie hymselfe to sitt still, and make himselfe guilty of the losse of all the honest partye, and of the nation itselfe."² This was a decisive declaration in favor of the monarchists, as Thurloe evidently believed. Cromwell was apparently determined to act, and in the way they desired. Still the opposition waxed no fainter, and the egress from the political *cul-de-sac* was not found. "I doubt the thinge most to be feared," said Thurloe, "is, that some men, who oppose, and, I beleeeve, will certainly disappoint such a settlement, which others can positively advise, doe not know what they would have; and it may be account it the best way to fix no where, but to fancye themselves in the condition of Israel in the wilderness, who knewe not overnight which way their journey was to lye the next morning. And truly," he adds, with acrid pleasantry, "I should rejoyce to be in this condition, if these gentlemen had as sure a guide as the Israelites."³ Only one thing was resolved upon—that a Parliament should be called as soon as possible. Undoubtedly to it would have to be remitted the solution of the problem of government.

All speculation and all further attempts were frustrated by the events of August and September, 1658. The illness of Lady Clay-

¹ "As I take it, the report was made to his highnesse upon thursday. After much consideration, the major part voted, that succession in the government was indifferent, wheither it were by election or hereditary; but afterwards some would needs add, that it was desirable to have it continued elective; that is, that the chiefe magistrate should alwayes name his successor, and that of hereditary avoyded, and I feare the word *desirable* will be made necessary, if ever it come upon the tryall." Thurloe to H. Cromwell, July 13, 1658, *ibid.*, 269.

² "I beleeeve wee are out of the daunger of our junto, and I thinke alsoe of ever havinge such another. . . . His highnes, findeing he can have noe advice from those he most expected it from, sayth, he will take his owne resolutions, and that he cannot any longer satisfie hymselfe to sitt still, and make himselfe guilty of the losse of all the honest partye, and of the nation itselfe; and truly I have long wished, that his highnes would proceed accordinge to his owne satisfaction, and not soe much consider others, who truly are to be indulged in every thinge but where the beinge of the nation is concerned." Thurloe to H. Cromwell, July 13, 1658, *ibid.*, 269.

³ Same to same, July 27, 1658, *ibid.*, 295.

poole kept Cromwell from all business and put off the calling of Parliament, so that it could not possibly meet before October.¹ As a consequence, the Parliament never met. Oliver died on the third of September, and all hope of successfully settling the government, excepting in the Stuarts, was at an end. The question concerning kingship had created a permanent division in the Cromwellian ranks, a division which must result in open and irreconcilable hostility after Oliver's death, while the contending factions were so nearly balanced. Had he lived ten years longer, no doubt he would gradually have weeded out the troublesome officers in the army, reconstructed his council, accepted the royal office, and suppressed the republican opposition. The decisive and immediate action so much desired by his son Henry he certainly never would have taken; and he would have been right in not taking it. Such action might have led to an immediate insurrection and so have destroyed all prospect of settlement. Men who had held power so long could not consent to being shelved in this easy fashion. Besides, if not friends of the younger Cromwells, they were the men who had most assisted in the making of Oliver. The situation demanded patience, a quality always at Oliver's disposal and always exercised by him. Time was the essential requisite, and had this been granted, the line of Cromwell might well have supplanted that of Stuart. There was no popular demand for the restoration of Charles II. What was known of him in England was distinctly to his discredit, and few even of his own partizans had hopes of his return. Time, however, was not granted. At Oliver's death the position of parties was such that Richard Cromwell's protectorate could not possibly endure; and the only wonder is that he managed to hold his own for the space of nine months. Even this would have been impossible, had the opposing factions been resolved upon anything, had they not been in such a condition that they did "not knowe what they would have" and could "fix no where." When once they had reached a conclusion, Richard fell; and so far as the Puritan cause was concerned, all could say, as Oliver feared he might be compelled to say, "*Actum est de Anglia.*"

RALPH C. H. CATTERALL

¹ "Thes late providences hath much retarded our publicke resolutions, that it will be October ere the parliament can sitt." Fleetwood to H. Cromwell, August 3, 1658, *ibid.*, 309.

ELECTION OF DELEGATES FROM NEW YORK TO THE SECOND CONTINENTAL CONGRESS

THE history of political parties in New York during the Revolution is the history of the differentiation of the popular party into revolutionist and loyalist. It is true that from the first there was the germ of a loyalist party in the so-called court faction which in the early part of the eighteenth century played an important part in provincial politics. But after 1733 the important fact was the growth of the popular faction under the lead of the Livingston family until in the early period of the Stamp Act troubles the court faction all but disappeared. For the moment the province found unity in a somewhat indiscriminating anti-British protest. But this unity was momentary only: from 1765 to 1776 the central fact was the gradual differentiation of the anti-British party into various factions, out of which were ultimately formed the irreconcilable parties of loyalist and revolutionist.

As early as the Stamp Act riots in November, 1765, the landed class began to draw away from the popular movement, estranged by the mob violence which threatened its property, and by the increasing importance of the unfranchised classes which threatened its political supremacy. In 1770 the merchants also separated from the popular party. The commercial disadvantage of absolute non-intercourse had driven them to advocate a policy of partial non-intercourse — non-intercourse, namely, in respect to those commodities only which were subject to parliamentary taxation. With the arrival of the East India Company's tea-ships in 1773-1774, the popular party was reorganized under the name of the Sons of Liberty; and the merchants and landed classes in a sense drew together and formed what may be called the conservative party. By 1774 the separation of radicals and conservatives was measurably complete. The latter, who wished to direct resistance along lines of compromise and conciliation, were in favor of partial non-intercourse and negotiation; the former, who were not unwilling to carry resistance to the very edge of revolution, were in favor of absolute non-intercourse and mob violence.

Such were the main issues round which centered the struggle for the delegates to the Continental Congress. The key to the

situation is to be found in the effort of the conservatives. While the progress of events from 1774 to 1776 in America and in England tended steadily to define the issue more and more precisely in terms of revolution and loyalism, the conservatives attempted throughout to steer a clear course between absolute resistance on the one hand and absolute submission on the other. They attempted to do this by gaining control of the popular organization and dictating through this organization the election of delegates to the first Continental Congress, and by opposing the effort of the radical organization to control through a provincial convention the election of delegates to the second Continental Congress. The significance of the period consists in the practical failure of the conservative programme, and in the ultimate disintegration of the conservative faction. In a previous paper¹ conservative activity in respect to the election of delegates to the first Continental Congress was considered. It is the purpose of this paper to show in some detail how the struggle for delegates to the second Continental Congress operated to complete the disintegration of the conservative faction.

While the conservatives were nominally successful in electing their delegates to the first Continental Congress, the action of that body was of immense importance in the party transformations of the immediate future — was, in fact, the first step in the disintegration of the conservative faction. Its immense importance lay in the fact that in sending delegates to a general congress the two factions in New York virtually agreed to throw the burden of forming a policy of resistance upon an authority outside the province; consciously or unconsciously, they thereby surrendered the privilege of having a policy of their own. The decision of Congress, while it carried no legal sanction with it, would necessarily exercise a profound influence, especially if it adopted the policy of one faction and rejected that of the other. This is almost precisely what the first Continental Congress did; it adopted a policy of absolute non-intercourse and drew up an Association to that effect, recommending that committees be appointed in every province, county, and town to see that it was signed as generally and enforced as rigorously as possible.² The radicals then had only to continue as they had begun. To the conservatives, on the other hand, two paths were open — either to use the decision of Congress as an excuse for changing their attitude, or to put themselves in opposition to the united decision of the colonies.³ It was manifestly impossible to follow both

¹ *Political Science Quarterly*, March, 1903.

² *American Archives*, I. 913.

³ Cf. Thomas Young to John Lamb, Oct. 4, 1774, MS. Papers of John Lamb, 1774-1775. The John Lamb Papers are in the New York Historical Society Library.

paths; composed, as the conservative party was, of incipient revolutionists and of incipient loyalists, it was impossible to follow either as a party. Practically, the result of the first Continental Congress was to split the conservative faction in two; a part followed one path, a part followed the other. The voice of all the colonies, speaking out, as it were, in sharp rebuke against the policy which the conservatives in New York had advocated, came like an ultimatum both to those who were ready for forcible resistance and to those who were prepared to remain faithful to the home government when no other alternative offered.

This result was realized with measurable completeness in the events leading up to the election of delegates to the second Continental Congress. Meanwhile, the question immediately in hand was whether the action of the first Continental Congress should be approved or not, and, if approved, how its recommendations respecting the Association could be most effectively carried out. In the city this led to the election of a new committee—the Committee of Sixty, sometimes called the Committee of Inspection.

On November 7 the Fifty-One resolved that the freemen and freeholders should be requested to assemble on November 18 at the usual places of election and choose eight persons in each ward to act as a committee of inspection for the enforcement of the Association.¹ In passing this resolution without a division the conservative committee may appear to have accepted the verdict of Congress without reservation. On closer inspection, however, it will be found that the committee was principally intent on making the best of a bad situation. In its recommendation for the election of committees Congress had suggested that the suffrage be limited to freeholders and freemen. There was some consolation for the Fifty-One in the fact that this limitation, if observed in New York, might place the control of the Association there in conservative hands. It is to be observed further that the resolution by which the conservative committee called for the election of committees of inspection made no provision for the dissolution of the Fifty-One; and it is more than likely that the new committees were intended to serve merely as ward committees under the supervision of the Fifty-One as a central committee. If the conservatives, therefore, took the first step in response to the recommendations of Congress, it was only that they still hoped to direct where they were no longer able to control; an initial willingness to act upon the suggestion of Congress might save, it was hoped, the life and influence of the conservative organization.

¹ *American Archives*, I. 328, 329.

It was hardly to be expected, perhaps, that the radicals would fail to see the tendency of such action. On Sunday, November 13, the Mechanics Committee, which now represented the radicals, published a broadside calling for a special meeting of that body at 4 o'clock and a general mass-meeting of all radicals at 5 o'clock on the following day, for the purpose of discussing the questions raised by the resolutions of the Fifty-One.¹ It is not known precisely what was done at either of these meetings, but it is obvious that the proposals of the conservative committee were found unsatisfactory. The Fifty-One on the evening of the same day addressed to the Mechanics Committee a letter requesting a conference on the day following, in order that a "mode that shall be agreeable to their fellow citizens in general" might be arranged.² This conference resulted in the adoption of a plan widely different from the original proposition of the conservatives. Instead of ward committees, there was to be a general committee of inspection of not more than seventy nor less than sixty members. It was to be elected by the freemen and freeholders, not in ward elections, but at the city hall, under the supervision of the vestrymen. Finally, it was understood that the election of the new committee should be followed by the immediate dissolution of the Fifty-One.³

If this arrangement is to be regarded as a compromise, it was a curiously one-sided one. There were two points which it was of serious importance for the conservatives, if they wished to remain conservative, to hold to—the limitation of the suffrage, and the continued existence of the Fifty-One. Virtually, both points were given up. It is true the suffrage was not technically extended, but the method of election was so changed that the suffrage ceased to be a matter of any importance: to say that the committee should be elected by the freemen and freeholders, at the city hall, under the supervision of the vestrymen, was only crudely to conceal the fact that the decisive method of election by ballot was to be replaced by the indecisive method of election in general mass-meeting. The second point was given up without reservation, and this was, after all, the matter of vital importance. Its importance consisted in the fact that in losing the Fifty-One the conservatives were

¹ Broadside, I. (Broadside used in this paper are from the collection in the New York Historical Society Library.)

² The letter was dated 6 o'clock, November 14, and addressed to Daniel Dunscomb, chairman of the Mechanics Committee. 4 *American Archives*, I. 329.

³ 4 *American Archives*, I. 330. In announcing this change the Fifty-One explained that whereas there was apprehended certain inconvenience from the first plan, and "this committee having taken the same into further consideration, and having consulted many of their fellow citizens, and also conferred with the Committee of Mechanics," etc.

losing their independent organization. The new committee, nominated by both factions, could not represent the conservatives as the Fifty-One had represented them. On the contrary, it would stand quite as much (more, indeed, as the sequel proved) for radicalism as for conservatism. There was, consequently, no more inherent reason for the dissolution of the old conservative Committee of Fifty-One than there was for the dissolution of the old radical Committee of Mechanics. But by the present arrangement, after both parties had united in the formation of a new joint organization, one party was required to dissolve its old special organization, the other was not.

The Fifty-One accordingly issued a second notice on November 15, indicating the change which had been agreed to. The election was fixed for Tuesday, November 22.¹ On that day a respectable number of "freeholders and freemen" appeared at the city hall; and the ticket which had been prepared according to agreement was elected without a dissenting voice.² With the election of the Committee of Sixty the Fifty-One ceased to exist.

The election of the Committee of Sixty and the dissolution of the Committee of Fifty-one was the logical result of the first Continental Congress. It prepared the way for the disappearance of the conservatives as a party. Since the colonies as a whole had taken a stand, it was out of the question for a local party to direct the resistance to the home government on lines laid down by itself. It was necessary to take the stand that all of the colonies had taken, or to stand against them: and to stand against them was very nearly the same, in the indiscriminating popular mind, as to stand with the home government. Increasingly the question which confronted each party was whether it would stand with Congress and the colonies or against Congress and with England. This question now confronted the conservatives in New York. As a party, there was no longer any place for them; as individuals, would they prefer ultimately to become loyalists or revolutionists? Some were ready for the latter; some could do no less than the former. The result was that just as the old Committee of Fifty-One had from the first practically had a large majority for conservative measures because the moderates were then prepared to work with the extreme conservative wing of that committee, so the new Committee of Sixty now had practically a large majority for radical measures because the same moderates were now prepared to work with the extreme

¹ *Ibid.*

² *Ibid.*; Colden, Letter-Book, II., *New York Hist. Soc. Coll., Fund Series*, X. 372; *Rivington's Gazetteer*, November 24, 1774; *New York Mercury*, November 28, 1774.

radical wing of this committee.¹ Of the original Fifty-One thirty members² found places on the Committee of Sixty. With one or two exceptions,³ these thirty were taken from the extreme radical wing of the Fifty-One and from those moderate conservatives who ultimately preferred to become revolutionists rather than loyalists. Those of the Fifty-One who found no place on the Sixty represented, for the most part, that phase of conservative thought which pointed away from revolution and towards loyalism. The thirty members of the Sixty who had not been members of the Fifty-One⁴ were men who represented, with some exceptions, radicalism in thought and in action.

In the counties, it has already been pointed out, scarcely any part had been taken in the agitation previous to the movement for the first Continental Congress. Even that movement had resulted there in little positive effort, and in no positive organization of those elements which in New York coalesced into the conservative faction: only the radicals, and they in some counties only, had made a beginning. Consequently, when Congress sent into the counties⁵ its recommendation for an Association, there was not there, as in the city, two definitely organized factions; there was, for the most part, only opinion, prejudice, and some conviction, mostly in solution. Yet the result of the first Continental Congress was essentially the same in the counties as in the city. As there was no longer any place for the conservative faction in the city, so it was too late for such a faction in the counties; in the counties, as in the city, it was increasingly a question of standing with the Congress or with the home government. The same process of separation into loyalists and revolutionists was begun in both places. The difference was that in the counties there was no conservative faction to be disintegrated, and there was less of a radical organization to work

¹ Smith to Schuyler, November 22, 1774, Lossing, *Schuyler*, I. 288; Colden to Dartmouth, December 7, 1774, Letter-Book, II., *New York Hist. Soc. Coll., Fund Series*, X. 372.

² Isaac Low, Philip Livingston, James Duane, John Alsop, John Jay, P. V. B. Livingston, Isaac Sears, David Johnson, Charles Nicholl, Alexander MacDougall, Thomas Randall, Leonard Lispenard, Edward Laight, William Walton, John Broom, Richard Hallett, Charles Shaw, Nicholas Hoffman, Abram Walton, Peter Van Schaack, Henry Remsen, Peter Curtenius, Abram Brasher, Abram P. Lott, Abram Duryee, Joseph Bull, Francis Lewis, John De Lancey, John B. Moore, Gilbert H. Ludlow.

³ Peter Van Schaack and Isaac Low were the notable exceptions.

⁴ John Lasher, John Roome, Joseph Totten, Samuel Jones, Frederick Jay, William W. Ludlow, George Janeway, Rudolphus Ritzema, Lindlay Murray, Lancaster Burling, Thomas Ivers, Hurcules Mulligan, John Anthony, Francis Barrett, Victor Bicker, John White, Theodore Anthony, William Goforth, Wm. Denning, Isaac Roosevelt, Jacob Van Voorhees, Jeremiah Platt, William Ustick, Comfort Sands, Robert Benson, William W. Gilbert, John Berrien, Nicholas Roosevelt, Edward Fleeming, Lawrence Embree.

⁵ The recommendation came to the counties through the Fifty-One. *American Archives*, I. 328, 329.

with. The process of separation was slower, the balance of power was not always with the radicals. Not until the force of arms began to replace free discussion did the disappearing opposition of the loyalists leave a free field for revolutionist organization.

In the counties, as in the city, the first question to be answered was embodied in the recommendations of Congress. While the Association was doubtless circulated in all of the counties, the result is unknown or was indecisive¹ except in the three that acted upon it favorably — Albany, Suffolk, and Ulster. The Albany committee, which had now become a permanent organization, ratified the action of Congress on December 10. So decidedly was the committee in favor of the Association that the New York delegates were requested to explain why they voted to permit the exportation of rice from South Carolina.² The Suffolk County committee met November 15 at the county hall, approved the action of Congress, and referred the enforcement of the Association to the town committees.³ In Ulster committees were appointed, agreeably to the resolution of Congress, in the towns of Kingston,⁴ New Windsor,⁵ Hanover,⁶ Showangnuk,⁷ and Walkill.⁸ Mention is made of a county committee, but whether this refers to the Kingston committee, which may very likely have acted as a county committee, or to a separately organized general county committee, is unknown. No organized opposition appears to have existed.

The remaining counties, so far as is known, did not individually place themselves on record as being either in favor of or in opposition to the policy of Congress. Some feebly intimated their confidence in the Assembly; others waited, perhaps, for that body to take the initiative. While the Assembly, which was elected in 1769, cannot be considered as in any sense representative even of the conservative counties at this time, its action is the only record we have of the sentiments of those counties that made no definite reply to the recommendations of Congress.⁹ Whether representa-

¹ *E. g.*, Dutchess, 4 *American Archives*, I. 1164. In Queens there appears to have been about equal division of opinion, *ibid.*, 1027, 1035, 1191; Onderdonck, *Documents and Letters*, 14, 17, 20, 21; *New York Mercury*, January 9, 16, 1775; *Rivington's Gazetteer*, January 5, 1775. In Orange about half refused to sign, *Calendar of Historical Manuscripts*, I. 5 ff.

² 4 *American Archives*, I. 1097, 1098.

³ *Ibid.*, 1257, 1258.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I. 1100; II. 298; *New York Mercury*, April 17, 1775.

⁵ 4 *American Archives*, II. 131, 133.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I. 1191.

⁷ *Ibid.*, I. 1183, 1230.

⁸ *Ibid.*, I. 1201.

⁹ The Assembly was petitioned to censure Congress and to negotiate with the King for redress of grievances. Cf. To the Freemen, Freeholders, *etc.*, January 19, 1775, Broad-sides, 1.

tive or not, the action of the Assembly in the winter of 1775 has this significance: much of the opinion, prejudice, and conviction which in the counties was still in solution after the first Continental Congress remained so for the time being because it was known that the colony's legal representatives were about to take a stand on the precise question which the extra-legal representatives of all the colonies had made the vital question — the question of standing with the colonies or with the home government. In February the Assembly took its stand; by a vote of almost two to one it was decided not to thank the delegates to the first Continental Congress and not to send any delegates to the second.¹ On the other hand, it attempted to take matters into its own hand; in March it sent a petition to the King, a memorial to the Lords, and a remonstrance to the Commons.² The action of the Assembly, which pleased the English government³ and helped to crystallize sentiment in New York, was an effort, and all but the last one, to stand in the place and to do the work of the old conservative Committee of Fifty-One. But it was too late to accomplish anything along these lines; the only result of the Assembly's action was still further to disintegrate the very party whose policy it was thus tardily attempting to make effective.

The first test had now been made. New York and three other counties had answered in favor of Congress; the rest had given no more definite answer than might be read into the action of the Assembly. The most important test was still to come — the election of delegates to the second Continental Congress.

The decision of the Assembly had no sooner cleared the way than the matter was taken up by the radicals in New York through their Committee of Sixty. On February 27 Van Brugh Livingston moved that the committee should take into consideration "the ways and means of causing delegates to be elected to meet the delegates of the other colonies . . . in general Congress."⁴ On March 1, when the question was again taken up, the committee, concluding that it had no power to elect the delegates itself, decided to refer the matter to the freeholders and freemen. A notice was accordingly published summoning the freemen and freeholders to meet at the Exchange on March 6 to "signify their sense of the best method

¹ *American Archives*, I. 1289, 1290; Colden, Letter-Book, II., *New York Hist. Soc. Coll., Fund Series*, X. 389; Deane Papers, V., *New York Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 1890, pp. 538, 539.

² *American Archives*, I. 313.

³ *Ibid.*, II. 27, 28, 29, 122, 123, 252.

⁴ *Broadsides*, I. The motion was carried with only one dissenting vote, that of Samuel Jones.

of choosing such delegates, and whether they will appoint a certain number of persons to meet such deputies as the counties may elect for that purpose, to join with them in appointing out of their body delegates for the next Congress."¹ Whether consciously worded or not, the fact is that the two purposes expressed in this document are somewhat inconsistent with each other. If the freemen and freeholders were to be asked to decide how they preferred to elect their delegates to Congress, it is not clear why they should be asked whether they would take part in a provincial convention; it is not clear why the committee should express a desire to refer the question of method in the election of delegates to the freemen and freeholders, and then, before there could be any decision of that point, thrust their own definite plan so intrusively in their faces. In truth it would be quite superfluous for the freemen and freeholders to consider the first question (the question of the best method) if they were expected in any case to consider the second question (the question of a particular method); and, under the circumstances, a refusal to adopt the committee's plan would be very nearly equivalent to a refusal to have any part in the second Continental Congress. It is clear, therefore, not only that the radicals were in favor of sending delegates to Congress, but also that they wanted those delegates to be chosen by a provincial convention composed of deputies from all the counties in the colony. Such a method of choosing delegates would almost necessarily diminish the relative influence of New York city in the Congress; it is, consequently, necessary to understand why the radicals in the city were in favor of a provincial convention.

The answer to this question is to be found in the fact that under existing conditions, in spite of the radical control of the Sixty, the old method of electing delegates would most likely result in sending the same kind of a moderately conservative delegation to the second Continental Congress that had been sent to the first; the relative influence of New York city was to be reduced in order that the influence of the colony as a whole might be less conservative. A brief review of the conditions which faced the radicals will make

¹ Broadside, I.; *Rivington's Gazetteer*, March 9, 1775; *New York Mercury*, March 6, 1775; 4 *American Archives*, II. 4. A provincial convention had been urged in connection with the election of delegates to the first Continental Congress, by the radicals in New York city in their resolutions of July 6, 1774 (*New York Mercury*, July 11, 1774), and again in their resolutions of July 20, 1774 (*New York Mercury*, July 25, 1774). In connection with the second Continental Congress the earliest suggestion appears to have come from Suffolk County. A county meeting on February 23, 1775, resolved that if the Assembly refused to appoint delegates, "the Committee of Correspondence for . . . New York be desired . . . in that case to call a provincial convention for that purpose." 4 *American Archives*, I. 1257.

this clear. The delegates to the first Continental Congress had been elected by counties. The apathy in the rural counties had resulted in sending a delegation from the colony in which the city delegates (five in number) exercised a determinative influence, not only because of their numbers, but also because of their personal ability and influence. That influence was, if not decisively conservative, at least only moderately radical. The problem which confronted the radicals was how to secure a delegation to the second Continental Congress which would exercise a more radical influence. If the old method of election was adopted, this could be done in one of two ways — either by electing a new and radical delegation from the city or by electing sufficiently large and radical delegations from the counties to outvote and, what was more important, to outweigh in influence the old delegation from the city. Neither plan was practicable. The old city delegates were men of the highest standing and of wide influence. They had not seriously opposed the action of the first Continental Congress, nor had they refused to support the Association. With two exceptions¹ they represented at its best that part of the conservative faction which was ultimately prepared to join the revolutionists. But they had not as yet gone very far in that direction. Without being sufficiently radical to suit the Committee of Sixty, they were not sufficiently conservative to be in any sense out of the race. To defeat these men was probably impossible; to attempt to do so was, in any case, impracticable. On the other hand, it was unwise to depend on the election of large radical delegations from the counties; the action of the counties on the Association had been all but decisive on that point. The alternative was a new method of election which would enable the Sixty at once to support the old city delegates and to neutralize their influence. A provincial convention would enable the Sixty to do this, because the city delegation to a convention might properly be made sufficiently large to leave the old delegates in a minority; whereas it would be out of the question to send so large a delegation from the city directly to the Congress. In the same way the convention could easily form a delegation for the province as a whole in which the old delegates should find a place, but in which they could no longer exercise a determinative influence; and this could most probably be done equally well whether the rural counties took an active part in the convention or not.²

¹ Isaac Low and John Alsop.

² The motives of the radicals are sufficiently well revealed in the broadsides which were circulated in defense of the convention. In answer to the objection that a convention will deprive the city of "their old delegates," it is stated that New York cannot

The conservative element, in the committee and out of it, divined the purposes of the Sixty and made an ineffectual attempt to defeat them. A meeting was held at Montagnie's on March 3, presided over by John Thurman. The proposals of the Sixty were disapproved of, first, because there was not time enough before March 6 to settle so important a question; second, because the method of taking the vote "by collecting the people together" was inexpedient, since it permitted of no distinction between freeholders and freemen, who had a right to vote, and "such as were collected on purpose to make a show of numbers"; third, because a provincial convention tended directly to the introduction of a provincial congress. It was accordingly suggested that the whole matter be postponed until the reply of the English government to the Assembly's proposals should have been received; if nothing could be effected in this way, then let the poll be opened in the usual places for the election of delegates to a convention by freemen and freeholders only. The conservatives declared they were not necessarily opposed to Congress, or even to a convention, but to the haste with which the matter was being pushed through.¹ The protest was scarcely heeded. An answering broadside appeared the next day,² and in the evening some radicals met and resolved to support the proposals of the committee.³

On Monday, March 6, the day fixed by the committee for the meeting, preparations began early. The vote was to be taken at noon. In mid-forenoon the radicals began to assemble at the liberty-pole, and by eleven o'clock they were on the way to the Exchange, carrying a banner on one side of which was the inscription,

presume to elect delegates for the whole colony, and, on the other hand, it is improper to crowd the Congress with delegates from each county. In another broadside of the same date, March 14, the author, who signs himself "A Friend to the Congress," says that "the necessity of this mode of choosing the delegates for the colony arises from the counties having taken offense at the conduct of this city in choosing the last delegates without consulting the counties. . . . The tale that your late delegates are excluded, is a mere trick; for there is the highest probability that they will be chosen by the deputies of the counties as they are in the . . . nomination of the committee." Broadside, I. Cf. 4 *American Archives*, II. 139.

¹ *Ibid.*, 48, 49.

² The author, who calls himself "A Tory," makes the following points: (1) The sense of the city can be taken Monday as well as any other time. (2) A convention is the plan used by the colonies of New Jersey, Virginia, Maryland, and North Carolina. (3) Little probability that the Assembly will appoint delegates. "And as to the danger of their being influenced by the measure, I really can see no great harm in a Representative being influenced by his constituents, on the contrary they ought to be." (4) As for waiting advice from England, "may as well wait for the conversion of the Pope as the arrival of the Packet." (5) "That whomever says the committee have prescribed rules for the counties, lies under a mistake, they mean only . . . to propose it to the counties and consult with them on the occasion." To the Learned and Loquacious Chairman, March 4, 1775, Broadside, I.

³ 4 *American Archives*, II. 48.

"George III Rex, and the liberties of America," and on the other, "The union of the Colonies, and the measures of Congress." About the same time the opposite party, strengthened, as was alleged, by royal officials, civil and military, began a similar procession from Montagnie's. When the processions met at the Exchange, a general mêlée was avoided with difficulty. Order having been restored, the chairman of the Sixty announced the questions upon which the vote was to be taken. The questions, as now announced, were not formulated as they had been by the committee in its handbill of March 1 — indeed they were not the same questions at all. The first question announced by the chairman was whether deputies should be sent to a provincial convention; the second, whether the people then present would authorize the committee to nominate eleven deputies to a provincial convention. On the first question the conservatives demanded a poll in order that the matter might be decided by freeholders and freemen according to the recommendation of Congress. This was refused, and the sense of the meeting was taken *en masse*. According to the radical account, both questions were carried by a very great majority. The conservatives, on the other hand, claimed that it was impossible to say whether the questions were carried or lost: consequently, even granting the propriety of the method of voting, it could not rightly be considered either that the county was in favor of a provincial convention, or, if it was, that any power of nomination had been conferred upon the committee.¹

Whether carried or not (probably a majority of those present were in favor of the committee), the framing of the questions was such as to make it impossible to settle them on their merits. The wording of the questions shows indeed that the Sixty had taken a full step in advance since issuing the first of March handbill. The committee had called the freeholders and freemen together to ask them what they considered the best method of electing delegates to Congress, and whether they were in favor of a provincial convention; now that they, together with others, were assembled, the committee really asked, not the freeholders and freemen, but the inhabitants generally, whether they would send delegates to a provincial convention, and whether they would authorize the committee to nominate *eleven* delegates to that convention. On the first of March two inconsistent questions had been presented together in such a way that the real issue had been whether New

¹ The official account of this meeting is in *Broadsides*, I. Two other more detailed accounts have been preserved, one by a radical sympathizer, the other by a conservative. The only points in which they disagree have been noted in the text. 4 *American Archives*, II. 48, 49.

York County should join in a provincial convention or not. On the sixth of March two questions somewhat different, but equally inconsistent with each other, were presented together in such a way that the real issue was whether the committee's method of sending delegates to a provincial convention should be adopted or not. The first alternative had been a convention or no Congress; within six days the alternative had become eleven deputies nominated by the committee or no congress.

A little closer consideration of the two questions presented by the Sixty on March 6 will make this all but obvious. A negative vote on the first question was practically equivalent to opposing the second Continental Congress. Undoubtedly there were many men in favor of Congress but opposed to the convention as a method of electing delegates to the Congress — men who, nevertheless, if the convention was legitimately determined upon, were willing to send delegates to it rather than not take part in the Congress at all. These men wanted a chance to vote against the convention and in favor of some other method. Yet the man who voted negatively on the first question said not, "I am not in favor of the convention as a method of choosing delegates," but, "I am not willing that New York County should join the other counties in sending delegates to the convention, and consequently to the Congress": such a vote, practically, would not have the effect of replacing the convention as a method by some other method, but merely of keeping New York County out of the movement altogether. More incisively than ever and not altogether fairly, there was presented to the conservatives the alternative of supporting the convention or of seeming to refuse to support Congress — by a shrewd sort of political legerdemain it had come about that supporting or opposing the radical committee was apparently identical with the alternative of standing with the colonies or with the home government. The second question was equally treacherous. The convention once determined upon, many men not in favor of it in the first instance, but willing if delegates were to be sent to it that the committee should nominate them, were not willing that the ticket should consist of eleven members. Such men could not vote against nominating a ticket of eleven delegates without voting against allowing the committee to nominate the ticket at all.

With questions presented in this fashion, those of the old conservative faction who were facing away from loyalism were likely to prefer to support the radical committee rather than give the appearance of refusing to support Congress: they thereby took a long step in the direction of revolution. Those of the old conservative

faction who were facing away from revolution doubtless preferred to give the appearance of opposing Congress rather than place that body unreservedly in radical hands: they thereby took a long step in the direction of loyalism. The meeting on March 6 was thus another and an important stage in the disintegration of the old conservative party. Those who voted in favor of sending deputies to the convention, and in favor of permitting the committee to nominate a ticket of eleven members, whatever their motives may have been for so voting, found themselves in the company of men who voted in the same way precisely for the purpose of imparting to Congress a radical and revolutionary impetus. On the other hand, those who voted, for whatever reason, not to join with the counties in a provincial convention, and against the nomination of delegates by the committee, found themselves in the company of men who voted in the same way because they considered conventions and congresses illegal and treasonable.¹

The Sixty proceeded at once to nominate a ticket. Without any serious opposition apparently, the old delegates — Isaac Low, Philip Livingston, James Duane, John Alsop, and John Jay — were named, together with six others — Leonard Lispenard, Abram Walton, Francis Lewis, Isaac Roosevelt, Alexander MacDougall, and Abram Brasher.² Of the new men, none was conservative like Duane or Low, none, perhaps, moderately judicious like Jay, none timid like Alsop. Three of them at least — MacDougall, Lewis, Roosevelt — were men who would speak and act effectively and unhesitatingly for radical measures. If the Sixty could get this ticket elected, it might well assume that without opposing the old delegates it had succeeded in neutralizing their influence.

The conservatives still had a fighting chance, perhaps, if they chose to use it: they might secede from the Sixty, as the radicals had done from the Fifty-One, and nominate a ticket of their own. But the radicals left the Fifty-One only after there was no more to be gained by remaining in it, and the conservatives had still something to gain by retaining a representation on the Sixty — the limitation of the suffrage to freeholders and freemen. All that was

¹ The conservative party which marched from Montaigne's was charged with numbering among its supporters officers of the army and navy, customs officers, and loyalist members of the Assembly. 4 *American Archives*, II, 48. Among the broadsides published in opposition to the committee was one signed a "Citizen of New York," in which the main arguments were: (1) That the only legal representatives of the colony, the Assembly, had refused to appoint delegates; (2) that, whatever reason there may have been for the first Congress, there was no reason for a second; (3) that the convention would lead to the introduction of a provincial congress, which in turn would usurp the functions of the Assembly. *Ibid.*, 44.

² Broadside, I.

accomplished, consequently, in respect to a separate organization was an informal and vain effort at the election to vote for the five old delegates without voting for the six new ones. In respect to the limitation of the franchise, however, the conservative leaders were able to attain their end. March 8, in committee meeting John Jay moved that the election should be held on March 15 in the wards, under the supervision of the vestrymen and subcommittees of the Sixty, and that the votes of freeholders and freemen only should be received.¹ The radicals felt the more safe in granting this, perhaps, since they would be able, now that a popular meeting had decided the initial question of the expediency of sending delegates at all, to force upon the voters the alternative of voting for the committee's ticket as a whole, or not at all. On March 15 the election was held. Eight hundred and twenty-five freemen and freeholders were in favor of sending deputies, and voted for the committee's ticket; one hundred and sixty-three voted negatively on both points. Many, on the other hand, offered to vote for the old delegates only. They were refused. The ticket of eleven members nominated by the Sixty was accordingly declared duly elected.²

Thus having succeeded in getting the support of the city for its plan, the committee issued a circular to the counties on the following day.³ The question was referred to the counties in much the same way as it had been referred to the city. The counties were asked, first, to consider the advisability of a provincial convention; second, to send delegates to a convention which was to meet (the Sixty took the liberty of fixing the day) at New York, April 20. Practically it was quite as useless for any individual county to consider the first question as it was impossible for the conservatives in the city to get an opportunity of doing so: the practical question before each county was whether it would send delegates to the convention, which, it appeared, was to meet in any case; or whether it would take no part in the convention. A refusal on the part of any county to send deputies to the convention would have no other practical effect than to leave that county without influence or voice in the second Continental Congress. In each county, therefore, the fight, where there was a fight, was virtually between those who were in favor of the second Congress and those who were not — between those who were going the way of revolution and those who were going the way of loyalism. There was no place in the

¹ *Ibid.*

² *4 American Archives*, II. 137, 138, 139; *New York Mercury*, March 20, 1775. The vote is given by wards in the *Mercury*.

³ *Broadside*s, I.; *4 American Archives*, II. 138.

counties any more than in the city for those who, without being loyalists, were not in favor of Congress, or for those who, without being hostile to Congress, were opposed to a provincial convention. The result, for the moment, was a rather marked increase in radical activity. Eight counties, aside from New York, sent deputies to the convention, though in three of them there was strong opposition; one, at least, definitely refused to be represented; three, so far as is known, took no action. In Albany County it was not primarily in response to the letter of the Sixty that delegates were elected. After the Albany committee had resolved, in December, 1774, to support the first Continental Congress, a new and more carefully organized county committee was established, which began to meet in January.¹ It was composed of deputies from the three wards of the city and from the precincts of the county. March 1, 1775, at a meeting of this committee the chairman produced a letter from the Albany members of the Assembly, which recommended that measures be taken for the election of delegates to Philadelphia. It was therefore resolved to request the subcommittees of the different districts in the county to assemble at Albany on March 21, "with full power to elect delegates."² Meanwhile the letter from New York reached Albany and gave a new direction to the activity of the committee. It is not known how this letter reached the various districts, but that it did reach them is evident from the fact that when the general committee met on March 21 all of the deputies had been authorized to elect delegates either to the Congress at Philadelphia or to the convention at New York.³ All of the committee except Henry Bogart were found to

¹ This new committee is commonly known as the Committee of Safety. The manuscript minutes of this committee, in two volumes, are preserved in the state library at Albany. The full title is "Minutes of the Proceedings of the Committee for the City and County of Albany, begun January 24, 1775." The two volumes cover the period from 1775 to 1778. Except at the beginning, the correspondence of the committee is omitted. At the beginning every page is numbered; near the close of the first volume the practice was introduced of numbering each leaf only; most of the second volume is not paged at all. For the privilege of examining these minutes I am indebted to the courtesy of Mr. J. F. A. Van Laer, keeper of the manuscripts at the New York State Library. For convenience the citation will be "Minutes of the Albany Committee."

² "A letter being produced by the chairman from Colls: Schuyler, Ten Broeck, and Livingston, members of the general Assembly, recommending the committee to appoint delegates to the intended Congress to be held at Philadelphia. . . . It was unanimously resolved that letters be wrote to the committee of the different districts of this county requesting their meeting at the House of Richard Cartwright the 21st day of this month, at two o'clock . . . with full power to appoint delegates." Minutes of the Albany Committee, I. 10.

³ "First the chairman put the question whether the members were fully authorized by their constituents to elect Delegates or Deputies to meet the Deputies from the other counties it appeared that they were unanimously empowered to appoint either."

be in favor of sending delegates to the convention; and a ticket of five members was unanimously chosen for that purpose.¹ In Kings County representatives of four townships met at the county hall April 15 and unanimously appointed five deputies to attend the convention. The township of Flatlands remained neutral, neither supporting nor opposing the measure.² In Orange County the four precincts of Cornwall, Goshen, Haverstraw, and Orangetown held separate meetings and named deputies.³ Of any opposition in these precincts, or of any action at all in others, there is no record. In Suffolk a county meeting was held at the county hall, April 6, and five delegates were chosen to represent the county.⁴ Ulster County chose delegates in the same way. On April 7 thirty-nine deputies, from ten towns, assembled at New Paltz. Three delegates were named.⁵ This action was approved by another town, Rochester, where a meeting was held on the same day. Opposition appears to have been confined to a letter signed by Cadwallader Colden, Jr., and Peter and Walter DuBois, protesting against the election as unlawful.⁶

In Dutchess, Queens, and Westchester there was strong opposition. Although Dutchess sent delegates in response to the New York letter, it is doubtful whether a majority of the inhabitants were in favor of doing so: it is certain that a majority of the precincts were not. The question was taken up first in the towns or precincts separately, although the meeting in Charlotte precinct is the only one of which a record has been preserved.⁷ Of the eleven precincts

Minutes of the Albany Committee, I. 12. The committee, at this meeting, consisted of fifteen members from the following districts: First Ward, 2; Second Ward, 1; Third Ward, 2; two districts of Rensselaerwyck, 2; Manor of Livingston, 1; Schaghtchick district, 2; Claverack, 1; Schoharie and Duanesburgh, 2; Nestegarie and Halfmoon, 1; Saratoga, 1. *Ibid.*

¹ "A motion was made by Walter Livingston whether Deputies shall be appointed to represent the City and County of Albany to meet the 20 day of April . . . at the city of New York. . . . Resolved, unanimously, that Deputies be appointed . . . Mr. Henry Bogart . . . dissented, he being for appointing delegates for the City and County of Albany to meet the intended congress at Philadelphia. Resolved by a majority that five persons be appointed. . . . Resolved unanimously that Abram Yates, Walter Livingston, Col. Schuyler, Colonel Ten Broeck and Col. Peter Livingston are appointed." *Ibid.*, 12.

² *Calendar of Historical Manuscripts*, I. 41.

³ *American Archives*, II. 275, 352, 353; *Calendar of Historical Manuscripts*, I. 2, 3.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I. 19.

⁵ George Clinton Manuscripts, I. 55; *Calendar of Historical Manuscripts*, I. 21, 22.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I. 22, 23; Schoonmacher, *Kingston*, 166.

⁷ The meeting was held April 7. The vote stood 140-35 in opposition to delegates. About 100 more appeared after the poll closed, and offered to vote for "constitutional liberty," but the advocates of the Congress "gave up the contest." *New York Mercury*, April 17, 1775; *American Archives*, II. 304.

in the county seven were opposed to sending delegates to the convention, four were in favor of doing so. The conservatives claimed that in the county as a whole there was a large majority opposed to the convention; the radicals claimed that there was a majority in favor of it.¹ On the strength of this claim a general meeting was held April 14, consisting of deputies from the four radical precincts, which named three delegates to represent the county.² Although it must be said, at the very least, that the wishes of Dutchess County were not ascertained in any satisfactory manner, the delegates were received by the convention. In Queens County the matter was taken up by the towns separately also. Three towns, Jamaica,³ Hempstead,⁴ and Oyster Bay,⁵ voted not to send delegates; two towns, Newtown⁶ and Flushing,⁷ appointed one delegate each. In Jamaica⁸ and Oyster Bay⁹ the radicals held subsequent meetings and appointed delegates to attend the convention as minority representatives. These four delegates (two representing two towns as such, two representing minorities in two other towns) attended the convention, but that body decided that Queens County was not entitled to vote on the measures which came before it. In Westchester careful management on the part of the radicals was all but necessary to get the county represented. The New York letter appears to have been communicated—it is not clear just how¹⁰—to twelve gentlemen residing in four towns¹¹ in the southern part of the county. These twelve gentlemen met at White Plains,

¹ *Ibid.*, 304, 305.

² *Calendar of Historical Manuscripts*, I. 41. The four precincts were Rheinbeck, North East, Armenia, and Rumbout. Poughkeepsie was one of the seven opposed to the convention. It seems not unlikely that Dutchess was far from having a majority in favor of the convention.

³ By vote of 94-82. *New York Mercury*, April 3, 1775; *Rivington's Gazetteer*, April 6, 1775; 4 *American Archives*, II. 251, 838, 839.

⁴ By resolution in town meeting. *Rivington's Gazetteer*, April 6, 1775; *Calendar of Historical Manuscripts*, I. 38, 39; 4 *American Archives*, II. 273.

⁵ By resolution in town meeting; vote, 205-42. Onderdonck, *Documents and Letters . . . of Queens County*, 26.

⁶ By a popular meeting of freeholders. It is said that 100 freeholders, a majority of all the freeholders in the town, were present. Jacob Blackwell was elected unanimously. 4 *American Archives*, II. 356; Onderdonck, *Documents and Letters . . . of Queens County*, 23; Ricker, *Newtown*, 179.

⁷ John Talman, elected by "great majority" in town meeting. 4 *American Archives*, II. 356; Onderdonck, *Documents and Letters*, 25.

⁸ Joseph Robinson. 4 *American Archives*, II. 356.

⁹ Zebulon Williams (formerly Seaman) was given "full power and authority to act" in behalf of forty-two freeholders. *Calendar of Historical Manuscripts*, I. 39, 40.

¹⁰ According to Dawson, there was no "vestage" of the old committee left in Westchester, to which the letter might be sent. He thinks the letter was sent to Lewis Morris and communicated by him to the twelve men. Dawson, *Westchester County*, 65, 66.

¹¹ Theodosius Bartow, James Willis, Abram Guion, of New Rochelle; William Sutton, of Mamaroneck; Lewis Morris, Thomas Hunt, Abram Leggett, of Westchester; James Horton, of Rye.

March 28, in order to devise means for "taking the sense of the county" on the subject of the convention. For this purpose a circular letter was issued by them and sent to the different districts, calling a general meeting of the freeholders and freemen at White Plains, April 11. As it was well known that the initiators of this movement were radicals, a letter was circulated by the conservatives, dated New York, April 6, urging all who were opposed to conventions and congresses and in favor of the Assembly's measures to assemble at the time and place appointed for the radical meeting.¹ On April 11, accordingly, some two hundred and fifty persons met at White Plains, the two parties establishing their headquarters at different taverns in the town. About 12 o'clock the radicals assembled at the court-house and were proceeding to the business of the day when the other party, led by Isaac Wilkins and Colonel Philips, marched in from Hatfield's tavern. Either from principle or from a consciousness of inferior numbers, they made no attempt to decide the question by ballot. Isaac Wilkins, speaking for the party, stated that they wished to have nothing to do with congresses or deputies, that their sole purpose was to protest against "such illegal and unconstitutional proceedings." Giving three cheers, the party returned to Captain Hatfield's, "singing as they went the grand and animating song of God save great George, our King." Here, certainly, conservatism was hardly to be distinguished from loyalism. Without further opposition the radicals at the court-house proceeded to appoint eight delegates to the convention. As usual, each party claimed a majority.² The one county which definitely refused to send delegates was Richmond;³ those which apparently took no action were Charlotte, Cumberland, Tryon, and Gloucester.

The provincial convention assembled at New York on April 20.⁴ Credentials of election were presented by delegates from New York, Albany, Ulster, Orange, Westchester, Kings, Suffolk, Queens, and Dutchess. The delegates from Queens were debarred from voting;⁵ but, even with this exception, a majority of the counties in the

¹ 4 *American Archives*, II. 282; Dawson, *Westchester County*, 67.

² The principal source for the meetings of March 28 and April 11 is the published statement made by Lewis Morris, who was chairman of the meeting of April 11. 4 *American Archives*, II. 314; *Calendar of Historical Manuscripts*, I. 20, 21; *New York Mercury*, April 17, 1775; *Rivington's Gazetteer*, April 20, 1775; Bolton, *Westchester County*, II. 349; Dawson, *Westchester County*, 67. The statement of Morris should be checked by the conservative account of the meeting of April 11, in *New York Mercury*, April 17, 1775; 4 *American Archives*, II. 321. Cf. second statement of Morris, May 7, *Ibid.*, 323.

³ Meeting of April 11 opposed convention almost unanimously. *Ibid.*, 313.

⁴ Minutes preserved complete. *Ibid.*, 351-358.

⁵ "That the gentlemen from Queens County, viz., John Talman, Joseph Robinson, Zebulon Williams, and Col. Jacob Blackwell, be allowed to be present at its deliberations

province were represented. On the following day the old delegates,¹ with the exception of Isaac Low and John Herring,² together with five others — Peter Schuyler, George Clinton, Lewis Morris, R. R. Livingston, and Francis Lewis — were elected to represent New York province in the second Continental Congress. Of this delegation the city's members were no longer a majority. One of the most conservative of the old city delegates, Isaac Low, had been replaced by an avowed radical, Francis Lewis. The conservative programme — the attempt to steer a clear course between absolute revolution on the one hand and submissive loyalism on the other — had broken down, and the disintegration of the conservative faction was practically complete: loyalists and revolutionists stood face to face.

CARL BECKER.

and will take into consideration any advice they may offer, but cannot allow them a vote; with which those gentlemen declare themselves satisfied." 4 *American Archives*, II. 356; Onderdonck, *Documents and Letters*, 22.

¹ Isaac Low, James Duane, Philip Livingston, John Jay, and John Alsop, of New York city; Henry Wisner and John Herring, of Orange; William Floyd, of Suffolk; Simon Boerum, of Kings.

² Herring gave satisfactory reasons for declining an election. Low was chairman of the Committee of Sixty, but he was not in sympathy with the radical policy of the committee. He was nominated, nevertheless, as one of the eleven deputies to the provincial convention. Before the election came off he announced that he would not attend the convention if elected. He was elected but did not attend. As the convention was limited to its own members in the choice of delegates to Congress, the secretary visited Low and asked him if he considered himself a member of the convention. He replied that he did not. 4 *American Archives*, II. 355, 357.

DOCUMENTS

1. *Correspondence of the Comte de Moustier with the Comte de Montmorin, 1787-1789*

(*Second Instalment.*)

VIII. MOUSTIER TO MONTMORIN.

(Archives des Affaires Étrangères, États-Unis, 1788, Tome 33, folios 238 ff.)

N° 18.

A NEWYORK, le 2. Août 1788
rec. le 26. septembre

Monseigneur.

Accession de l'Etat de New York à la nouvelle Constitution qui se trouve adoptée par onze Etats.

Reflexions sur les suites qu'opérera cette nouvelle Constitution.

L'Etat de Newyork a enfin accédé le 25. du mois d' à la nouvelle Constitution, qui se trouve adoptée par onze Etats. Les modifications recommandées sont si nombreuses et si importantes, que si le nouveau Congrès y a égard, cette Constitution conservera à peine l'apparence de sa première forme. Cependant on a porté un grand coup à la souveraineté particulière des Etats pris séparément. Le phantome de Démocratie qui avoit séduit le peuple est au moment de disparoitre. La majorité crédule enivrée des plus belles espérances, dont elle s'est laissé repaître, a forgé elle-même les liens, par lesquels tôt ou tard les Chefs du peuple parviendront à l'assujettir et à le gouverner après avoir paru vouloir lui obéir. La Constitution est prise à l'essai jusqu'à ce qu'on en trouve une meilleure. Cette disposition à toujours perfectionner est infiniment favorable aux vues des ambitieux, qui parviendront à force de changemens à lasser le peuple Américain et à lui faire recevoir par nonchalance le joug qu'on lui prépare et qu'il supportera probablement beaucoup plus patiemment qu'on ne le pense. Les modifications proposées offrent d'emblée une foule de prétextes même pour une refonte de Gouvernement. Cette voie est ouverte aux divers partis. Il n'est pas douteux qu'ils n'en profitent chacun selon leurs vues.¹

¹ Three years later, when Moustier represented France at the court of Berlin, he published a pamphlet entitled *De l'Intérêt de la France à une Constitution Monarchique*. In it he makes the following remarks on the American Constitution: "La nécessité d'une constitution a été sentie par les hommes sages et les vraies politiques des Etats Américains. En dignes imitateurs de Solon, ils en ont rédigé une qui, si elle n'est pas la meil-

fêtes données à cette occasion, par les Corps et métiers, et auxquelles le Congrès a assisté, ainsi que les Ministres Etrangers.

La nouvelle Constitution a paru un remède à tous les maux dont gémissent les Etats-Unis. La joie de la majorité s'est exprimée particulièrement par des réjouissances publiques. Différentes villes ont fait des processions où toutes les classes de Citoyens ont figuré. Celle de Newyork n'a même pas attendu que la Convention de l'Etat auquel elle appartient eut prononcé. Elle a fait sa procession dans un moment où l'on doutait fort que l'Etat adoptât la Constitution. Ce qu'il y a eu de particulier à cette fête populaire c'est que le Congrès ait hasardé d'en sanctionner en quelque sorte l'objet, qui étoit de manifester l'opinion particulière de la ville en opposition avec celle qu'on supposait à l'Etat, en assistant en corps et par conséquent comme souverain à un repas assés médiocre donné par les corps et métiers de la ville. J'avois été invité et j'ai assisté à ce repas à la droite du Congrès et ayant à la mienne de suite le Ministre Plénip.^{re} des Etats Généraux, le Chargé d'affaires Plénip.^{re} d'Espagne, les Consuls et autres étrangers de distinction. A la gauche du Congrès étoient ses officiers et les Membres du Clergé de la Ville, Anglicans, Presbytériens, Catholiques, Luthériens, Calvinistes, Juifs, tous indistinctement, excepté que l'Eveque Anglican avoit pris la droite de tous les autres et avoit dit le *benedicite*. Le Congrès s'étant aperçu lui-même qu'il étoit déplacé dans cette fête comme faisant corps a voulu soutenir ensuite qu'il n'y avoit point été comme Congrès, mais j'ai insisté partie en riant, partie sérieusement avec les différens Membres que telle avoit été l'opinion de tout le monde, que sans cela ils auroient dû être épars parmi les convives et que j'aurois dû être à la droite du Président. Au reste tout ce cérémonial peut être regardé comme sans conséquence, quoiqu'on cherche à en mettre partout, il n'est encore réglé sur rien; mais c'est une maladie de ce pays apportée de la Mère-patrie, où l'on forme des prétentions de ce genre à chaque instant. Il faut espérer que cet inconvénient disparaîtra insensiblement.

Un des objets de la fête des Citadins de Newyork étoit de cajoler le Congrès et de l'engager à ajourner ici le nouveau corps souverain. Le Congrès de son côté a paru vouloir

leur qu'on pût leur donner, est la meilleure qu'ils pussent recevoir, eu égard à toutes les circonstances. Ils ont eu même le ménagement de conserver le nom de Confédération, tandis qu'ils opéraient une consolidation. . . . Ils ont eu cet égard pour la faiblesse d'un peuple ombrageux et qui n'étoit pas assez généralement éclairé sur les avantages de mettre des bornes à la liberté naturelle pour mieux la garantir. Enfin la constitution Américaine a fait de l'agrégation des tous les Etats Américains une véritable Monarchie sous le titre d'une union qui chaque jour développera davantage les traits encore faiblement prononcé d'une organization monarchique." Note b, pp. 97-100.

remettre sa décision à cet égard au moment où la Convention auroit adopté la Constitution. Quelques uns de ses Membres n'ont pas négligé d'insinuer que cette incertitude étoit le seul obstacle qui empêchoit le Congrès d'ajourner le nouveau ici. Ce leurre a eu son effet. Les Fédéralistes de la Convention ont même été jusqu'à avancer qu'il n'y auroit aucune difficulté dès que l'Etat de Newyork seroit entré dans la nouvelle union. Aujourd'hui que la feinte n'est plus nécessaire les Pennsylvaniens mettent tout en jeu pour obtenir la préférence en faveur de Philadelphie. La semaine entière a été employée en débats sur ce sujet, dans lequel il paroît que l'intérêt personnel a bien plus de part que l'intérêt public.

question agitée sur le lieu et le tems où sera ajourné le Congrès.

La question de l'ajournement pour le lieu et le tems auxquels il convient de le fixer a excité l'attention de tous les Etats et en conséquence il se trouve ici des Délégués de chacun d'eux ; ils se disperseront vraisemblablement dès que ces deux objets seront décidés. Les Délégués de Rhodeisland se contentent d'assister aux délibérations sans prononcer sur une question qui peut-être regardée comme étrangère à leur Etat puisqu'il a rejeté la nouvelle Constitution.

tableau de la nouvelle Constitution dont M. de Moustier fera l'envoi, dès que l'opinion de la Nord Caroline sera connue.

Dès que l'opinion de la Nord Caroline sera connue, j'aurai l'honneur de vous présenter, Monseigneur, dans un même ensemble la Constitution telle qu'elle a été proposée par la Convention générale avec le rapprochement des différentes modifications proposées par les Conventions particulières. Je séparerai cet exposé des observations que je me propose d'avoir l'honneur de vous soumettre sur l'influence de la Constitution sur la politique extérieure des Etats-Unis et sur les probabilités du système qui pourra prévaloir à cet égard.

On a eu ici un exemple de ce qu'on doit attendre du parti dominant dans les changemens de Gouvernement malgré le beau nom de liberté qui se trouve bien rarement répondre aux faits. Un malheureux Imprimeur qui s'est mis le dernier à fabriquer une gazette dans une ville où il y en a beaucoup trop, avoit imaginé pour donner de la vogue à sa feuille de recueillir les petits propos et les petits faits contraires au parti fédéraliste. Une mauvaise plaisanterie sur un accident arrivé à la procession fédérale a été punie par la destruction de son imprimerie et des insultes personnelles l'ont obligé à fuir sa maison et à l'abandonner aux champions de la liberté, qui en font souvent un terrible usage contre les plus foibles, lorsque ceux-ci ont l'imprudence d'user sans précaution de celle qu'ils croient avoir de leur côté.

Je suis avec respect

etc.

LE C^{te} DE MOUSTIER.

IX. MOUSTIER TO MONTMORIN.

(Archives des Affaires Étrangères, États-Unis, 1788, Tome 33, folios 332 ff.)

N^o 26. A NEWYORK le 18. Novembre 1788
rec. le 11 fév. 1789*Monseigneur.*

regrets de M. de Moustier sur l'interruption des Paquebots, surtout dans la circonstance du changement de la constitution américaine.

L'interruption des Paquebots m'a privé entièrement jusqu'à présent de l'avantage de recevoir quelque réponse aux différentes Dépêches que j'ai eu l'honneur de vous adresser. J'en ai d'autant plus de regret que depuis mon arrivée sur ce Continent j'ai vû consommer une révolution dans le Gouvernement des Etats-Unis, qui change entièrement les rapports sous lesquels on a pû les envisager jusqu'à présent.

Mémoires préparés par M. de Moustier sur la manière d'envisager la nouvelle constitution.

mémoire rédigé par M. de Moustier qui renferme un plan sur la manière de rendre utile au Roi la nouvelle constitution américaine.

J'ai préparé en conséquence des Mémoires¹ pour vous exposer les différents points de vûes sous lesquels on peut envisager les effets du nouveau Gouvernement Américain ; mais d'une part ils sont un peu trop étendus, pour pouvoir être transcrits en chiffre et d'une autre je ne puis trouver une occasion sûre, pour vous les faire parvenir. J'attends toujours avec confiance, Monseigneur, que vous m'en fournissiez une vous-même. J'ose même me flatter qu'avant la réception de mes mémoires dont l'un renferme un plan général de conduite envers les Américains unis, vous m'aurez vous-même prescrit en partie d'adopter la marche que je crois la plus propre à rendre utile au Roi, une révolution, dont il a recueilli tant de gloire.

Importance du moment actuel pour profiter des avantages que nous offre la nouvelle constitution.

Le moment actuel est critique ; il nous est favorable, mais il seroit possible qu'un trop long délai nous fit perdre une occasion, qui ne se retrouveroit peut-être plus avec les mêmes avantages. Je dois penser que l'Angleterre qui a traité depuis la paix des Etats-Unis avec un dédain, fondé sur leur situation réelle, plustôt que sur celle dont on auroit pû les croire susceptibles, changera de conduite envers eux, dès qu'Elle aura reconnu la stabilité et la régularité de l'administration, dont la nouvelle constitution les rend susceptibles.

propos du Général Washington sur les moyens qu'a le Roi de faire que les Etats-Unis trouvassent leur intérêt dans leurs liaisons avec S. M.

J'ai lieu de me louer des dispositions que j'ai trouvées dans plusieurs des principaux personnages influents sur ce Pays-ci. J'ai été parfaitement satisfait en particulier du Général Washington, avec qui j'ai passé plusieurs jours. Le résultat de ses conversations a été en propres termes "que
"très certainement on étoit encore animé dans les Etats-Unis
"d'une vive et sincère reconnaissance envers le Roi et la

¹ The titles of these *mémoires* were : I. "Aux Conséquences probables de l'établissement du nouveau Gouvernement quant à l'administration intérieure des Etats-Unis" ; II. "Des rapports du nouveau Gouvernement des Etats-Unis avec les Puissances étrangères."

“nation française ; mais que néanmoins l'intérêt seul pou-
 “voit fixer les liaisons entre nations ; qu'il étoit très aisé de
 “reconnoître qu'il ne tenoit qu'à Sa Majesté de faire en sorte
 “que les Etats-Unis trouvaissent leur intérêt à être étroite-
 “ment unis avec Elle.”

Le G^e Wasington sera
 Président des Etats-Unis,
 si cela lui convient, im-
 portance de son pouvoir
 en cette qualité.

Cette conclusion est d'autant plus remarquable, que le
 G^e Wasington sera président des Etats-Unis, si cela lui con-
 vient, et que son pouvoir et son influence en cette qualité
 sont de la plus grande importance selon la nouvelle Constitu-
 tion. J'ai taché dans toutes les occasions, sans me compro-
 mettre de faire penser que si jusqu' à présent nos liaisons avec
 les Américains n'ont pas été plus étroites, la faute n'en doit
 être attribuée qu'à leur constitution vicieuse, et que la révo-
 lution qu'Elle vient d'éprouver a toujours été désirée par S.
 M. et son Conseil. Ce langage me paroît utile et même
 nécessaire, en pensant que l'évènement est en quelque sorte
 consommé, et qu'il ne s'agit plus que d'en tirer le meilleur
 parti. C'est au mois de Mars que le nouveau Congrès doit
 s'assembler ; l'époque est prochaine. S'il vous paroît néces-
 saire, Monseigneur, que je reçoive des instructions conformes
 à un ordre de choses qui ne subsistoit pas à mon départ du
 Royaume, je pense que dans le cas où les paquebots, pour
 communiquer avec les Etats-Unis, ne seroient pas encore
 rétablis, vous pourriez néanmoins me les faire parvenir par
 un avis.

C'est au mois de Mars
 que le Congrès doit s'as-
 sembler.

Instructions que de-
 mande M. de Moustier
 relativement au nouvel
 ordre de choses qui va
 s'établir.

diminution du Com-
 merce de l'Ang^{re} en
 Amérique.

réflexions sur les
 moyens de faire fructifier
 le commerce de France
 en Amérique.

grande utilité qu'il y
 auroit à rétablir les paque-
 bots, en faveur du com-
 merce.

On regrette particulièrement l'interruption des paquebots
 dans des circonstances, qui sembloient favoriser des spécula-
 tions plus sûres et plus régulières entre les deux nations. Le
 Commerce d'Angleterre diminue un peu. Quelques manu-
 factures américaines fournissent des objets communs qu'on
 tiroit auparavant de la Grande Bretagne. Le peu d'articles
 qu'on commençoit à importer de France avoit un débit
 assuré. Mais ce n'est en quelque sorte qu'en tatonnant que
 les Commerçans François et Américains reprennent un Com-
 merce qui a été entrepris d'abord avec une hardiesse que rien
 n'autorisait et qui provenoit de la présomption plutôt que de
 la connoissance réelle que les deux nations avoient de leurs
 ressources et de leurs moyens. Ces premiers essais doivent
 être encouragés ; ils sont les germes d'un commerce qui con-
 duit sagement et graduellement peut offrir d'autant plus
 d'avantages qu'ils sont réciproques. Pour les favoriser il faut
 assurer aux deux nations des voyes de correspondance. Si le
 Commerce avoit acquis toute l'étendue dont il est susceptible
 il entretiendrait lui-même ces voyes, mais il n'est que naissant
 et à peine dans l'enfance ; si le Roi ne vient pas à son secours
 cette enfance sera longue. Je ne puis m'empêcher de croire
 quel' établissement des Paquebots *pour les Etats-Unis* est cer-

tainement considéré comme utile et que la dépense qu'il peut occasionner n'est qu'une très légère avance faite pour ouvrir des canaux qui la feront rentrer au Centuple. Plusieurs négocians accoutumés à donner et à recevoir des commissions par cette voye ont été pris au dépourvu et ont souffert d'une interruption qui a eu lieu avant qu'ils en aient pu être avertis, tandis que beaucoup de leurs spéculations ont manqué par cet événement. Quelques uns même sont obligés d'aller en France par la voie de l'Angleterre pour régler leurs affaires. Aujourd'hui il se répand que le Royaume a besoin de grains par une suite de la grêle qui a détruit une partie des récoltes, que la guerre entre les Puissances du Nord de l'Europe prive de la ressource des grains de Pologne, que la côte de Barbarie n'en peut point fournir cette année et que par conséquent les Etats-Unis pourroient subvenir dans cette circonstance au besoin du Royaume. On pense que cet événement seroit infiniment favorable pour étendre le Commerce entre les deux Nations puisque les Américains auroient des moyens de payer en denrées la valeur d'une grande quantité de marchandises de France, auxquelles aujourd'hui faute de capitaux et de crédit ils sont obligés de renoncer. Cependant malgré ces apparences flatteuses les Américains aiment mieux se borner à leurs opérations circonscrites dont ils connoissent d'avance le résultat que de se livrer à celles qu'ils ne peuvent calculer avec précision faute d'informations assés sûres et assés promptes. Je me suis un peu étendu, Monseigneur, sur une partie des effets de l'interruption des paquebots, parceque dans la situation où je me trouve, je suis plus à portée que personne de les apercevoir et que je suis persuadé qu'il suffit de les indiquer pour engager le Conseil du Roi à opiner pour la conservation d'un établissement très avantageux quoiqu'aussi peu coûteux que peut l'être celui des paquebots selon le plan que j'ai adressé au secrétaire d'Etat de la Marine au commencement de cette année.

les Etats-Unis auroient pu subvenir cette année au besoin que nous avons de nous procurer du blé.

inconvenients qui résultent de l'interruption des paquebots.

Les onze Etats qui ont adopté la nouvelle Constitution s'occupent du choix des sénateurs et représentants au nouveau Congrès.

différence qu'il y aura entre les pouvoirs du nouveau Congrès avec ceux de l'Ancien.

Les onze Etats, qui ont adopté la nouvelle Constitution sont occupés actuellement du choix des sénateurs et des représentants qui doivent siéger au nouveau Congrès ainsi que des Electeurs qui doivent élire le Président et le vice-Président des Etats-Unis. Quelques sénateurs sont déjà nommés ; on présume quels pourront être les autres et l'on en augure très favorablement. Il paroît qu'à aucune époque les intérêts du peuple Américain n'auront été confiés à des hommes plus distingués par leurs lumières, leur zèle, et leur talens. Il n'y aura de rapport entre l'ancien et le nouveau Congrès que dans le mot employé pour désigner le corps chargé de la puissance publique. Le nouveau l'aura de fait et pourra jouir de la considération attachée aux hommes qui en sont revêtus.

L'ancien ne possédoit que l'ombre de l'autorité souveraine, qui avoit acquis quelque consistance dans un tems de crise et qui avoit paru dans sa vraie forme dès que le danger avoit disparu. Il étoit tems pour la dignité et les intérêts des Etats-Unis qu'un corps réduit presque à l'avilissement plus encore par défaut de force que par manque de sagesse fut remplacé par un Congrès qui réunit l'un et l'autre. Aussi les Candidats qui aspirent à l'un sont ils fort différens de ceux qui composoient l'autre en général. Dans le moment actuel, quoique chaque Etat ait nommé les Membres qui doivent composer le Congrès pour le tems qu'il a encore, non pas à agir, mais à figurer, il ne se trouve que trois Délégués en tout dans cette ville. L'année fédérale étant expirée au premier Lundi de ce mois il n'y a plus de Président du Congrès et comme il faut sept délégations complètes pour en élire un, peut-être n'y procédera-t-on qu'au moment de la transmutation du Gouvernement. Les Officiers du Congrès sont également dispersés, de sorte qu'il subsiste une espèce d'interrègne dans la Confédération Américaine de même que depuis longtemps elle a été dans une sorte d'anarchie sourde, qu'on peut comparer à une fièvre lente. Mais si les hommes publics ne s'occupent pas des affaires dans ce moment, on ne sauroit douter que les particuliers ne soient fort actifs dans toutes les démarches qui peuvent leur donner quelque importance ou leur procurer quelque avantage sous le nouveau Gouvernement.

Je suis avec respect

Monseigneur,

Votre très humble et très obéissant serviteur

LE C^{te} DE MOUSTIER.

X. MOUSTIER TO MONTMORIN.

(Archives des Affaires Étrangères, États-Unis, 1789, Tome 34, folios 34 ff.)

N^o 8.

A NEWYORK le 20 Mars 1789.

rec. le 29 Juin.¹

Monseigneur.

expiration de l'ancien Congrès, remarque sur la manière dont il s'étoit formé.

Une nouvelle époque dans l'histoire de l'Amérique unie est marquée actuellement par l'expiration du Congrès composé d'abord des Délégués de treize Colonies de la Grande Bretagne, qui s'étoient unis pour consulter sur les moyens d'obtenir le redressement de leurs griefs contre la Mère patrie, qui ensuite se sont confédérées pour agir et enfin se

¹ Under the same date and enclosed with this despatch there is the copy of an article which Moustier had prepared for publication in the *Gazette de France*. Among other things this article says: "On peut donc dire que depuis le mois de Nov^{bre} dernier les Etats-Unis n'ont pas eu de

sont déclarées Etats libres et indépendans. Dans ces différens degrés de pouvoirs le Congrès n'en a jamais joui d'aucun bien réel. La crainte dans les premiers tems réunissoit les esprits, toujours portés dans les momens de crise et de souffrance à obéir à la voix qui les guide, la déférence apparente d'un Général que sa prudence et son bonheur rendoient le premier homme du peuple qu'il défendoit, les égards témoignés par les étrangers contribuoient également à donner une grande considération au Congrès.

L'éloignement du danger, l'inutilité du Sauveur de la patrie, la présomption qu'on n'avoit plus aucun besoin de secours étrangers a réduit le Congrès à l'exercice véritable de ses fonctions qui consistoient à délibérer sans avoir aucun moyen de coercion. Tout aboutissoit à des résolutions, et des recommandations, dont l'exécution dépendoit des gens, dont les intérêts particuliers étoient absolument en opposition avec les intérêts publics. Aussi quoique la plupart des résolutions et des recommandations du Congrès fussent dictées par la sagesse et assés généralement par l'honneur elles sont presque toujours restées sans effet. Son impuissance ayant été sentie, quelques hommes sages ont cherché à y remédier de bonheur en attribuant au Congrès l'exercice réel de certains pouvoirs. Cette première idée à bientôt été entendue jusqu'à une réformation totale à laquelle ont concouru également des hommes bien intentionnés et d'autres qui ont vû que dans un si grand changement ils trouveroient une voie ouverte à leur ambition. Dans le passage d'une idée à l'autre et durant le tems employé à la réformation du Gouvernement fédéral, le Congrès étoit tombé graduellement dans une sorte de mépris, qui rendoit les gens les plus considérables presque honteux d'y entrer. Beaucoup d'autres dont les occupations étoient lucratives refusoient de remplir des places, où il n'y avoit ni honneur ni profit à acquérir. Un très petit nombre de gens de mérite se sont trouvés dans ce corps pendant ces dernières années. La majorité des membres qui le composoient étoient des oisifs sans état, sans occupations et sans talens ou de jeunes gens à peine sortis du collège. La petite rétribution qui leur étoit accordée et le titre d'*honorable* attaché au caractère de Délégué subvenoient aux besoins des uns et flattoit la vanité des autres. Le Con-

Classe des gens qui
composoient la majorité
des Membres du Congrès.

Gouvernement général et que cette machine a besoin d'être entièrement remontée. Les admirateurs outrés de la république Américaine pourront se convaincre à présent de la grande distance qu'il y a d'une theorie brillante à une pratique heureuse, et que pendant qu'ils s'eventuoient en Europe à prouver l'excellence de la constitution des Etats Unis, cet edifice tomboit déjà en ruine et étoit détruit par ceux mêmes qui l'avoient élevé au prix de leur sang et de leur fortune. *Ibid.*, folios 43-44.

grès conservoit l'ombre de l'autorité équivoque, dont il avoit joui et paroissoit de loin encore comme un phantome de Souveraineté. Mais il étoit tems qu'il fut remplacé puisqu'il n'avoit pû être réformé. L'union Américaine alloit cesser s'il ne se fut élevé un nouveau centre plus capable de consolider toutes les parties qui devoient s'y réunir.

observation sur la manière dont auroit dû se conduire le Congrès en cessant d'exister.

Il semble que l'ancien Congrès avant de cesser d'exister auroit dû chercher à donner quelques signes de vie qui eut laissé un souvenir honorable de ses dernières actions. Il auroit pû recueillir tous les renseignemens propres à faciliter les premières opérations d'un corps constitué pour agir, il auroit pû préparer les expéditions des affaires depuis longtems restées sans exécution, il auroit pû enfin puisque ses prétentions étoient de figurer comme un corps revêtu de la Souveraineté, faire des dispositions qui eussent donné à sa fin une apparence de transmutation, au lieu d'une extinction qui a caractérisé la nullité et la foiblesse en quelque sorte honteuse d'un corps impuissant. Quelques membres du petit nombre de ceux, qui avoient quelque idée de patriotisme ont eu le désir de faire un acte de décence et d'utilité, mais le plus grand nombre, celui des insoucians et des incapables étoit dispersé, de sorte que le Congrès n'a même pas pû se former et qu'il a cessé d'être sans avoir même existé depuis le renouvellement de l'ancienne année fédérale qui commençoit en Novembre.

Prétentions de quelques membres de l'ancien Congrès.

On est surpris après cette espèce d'existence de voir les membres qui se trouvent encore ici en petit nombre prétendre composer encore un Corps et s'efforcer de réunir quelques uns de leurs confrères pour former un Congrès selon l'ancienne constitution fédérale, tandis que d'un autre côté les membres du nouveau Congrès se sont assemblés régulièrement depuis le jour, auquel le nouveau gouvernement fixe sa naissance. Il se trouve de cette manière deux soleils à la fois sur le Continent Américain. L'un n'a plus ni chaleur, ni éclat, l'autre est à peine sur l'horison, il faut le voir s'élever pour le juger. Il n'est pas trop certain qu'il ne soit pas offusqué par quelques nuages avant de parvenir à l'élévation vers laquelle il tend. Ces nuages pourront renfermer et développer plus d'un orage.

C'est une petite tache pour un Gouvernement annoncé comme plus actif et plus énergique que celui auquel il succède de se trouver à sa naissance dans un état de nullité ; car tout ce que peuvent faire les membres actuels, c'est de se rassembler tous les jours pour s'ajourner. Leurs conversations ne sont d'aucun poids, elles ne peuvent aboutir à aucune résolution légale, tant qu'ils ne formeront pas un nombre compétent, ce qui s'appelle un *quorum* dans chaque Chambre. Le *quorum* du Sénat doit être de 12., ce qui fait une voix de plus que la

moitié du complet. Celui de la chambre des représentans du peuple doit être de 30 sur 59 qui font le nombre complet pour les onze Etats-Unis.

le retard de plusieurs membres du nouveau Congrès empêche de s'occuper des affaires majeures—cause de ce retard.

Il parait qu'on n'est pas encore d'accord quelles affaires les deux Chambres pourront traiter avant que le Congrès se trouve entièrement formé par la déclaration de l'élection du Président des Etats-Unis qui forme la troisième branche de ce corps, sous sa nouvelle forme. Mais cette déclaration est précisément de leur compétence actuelle puisqu'il est stipulé par la nouvelle Constitution que les billets d'élection qui ont été envoyés cachetés par les Electeurs à l'ancien Congrès et qui sont actuellement sous la garde du secrétaire de ce Corps doivent être ouverts par le Sénat en présence des représentans. Le retard des membres, qui auroient pu être déjà arrivés a empêché jusqu'à présent de procéder à une opération aussi importante. On voudrait faire croire que les mauvais chemins sont la cause de ce retard, mais le grand nombre ne se prête pas à cette excuse, d'autant que l'Etat de Jersey et celui de Delaware sont si près de cette résidence fédérale qu'il n'y a aucun prétexte plausible à alléguer pour justifier l'absence des membres de ces deux Etats. Le fait est que les gens qui composent le nouveau Congrès quoique généralement beaucoup mieux choisis que ceux de l'ancien se ressentent de l'indifférence générale pour la chose publique dès qu'il s'agit d'y mettre du sien. Quand personne en particulier ne peut être chargé de la honte publique, il arrive souvent que l'honneur et l'utilité publics sont compromis. Les Etats-Unis en ont fait l'expérience. Il est à désirer que le nouveau Gouvernement puisse remédier aux anciens abus qui ont avilé le Congrès.

Tous les membres du nouveau Congrès ne sont pas encore nommés : pourquoi.

La négligence qu'ont mise plusieurs Etats à procéder aux élections des nouveaux membres soit en s'y prenant trop tard, soit en ne s'occupant pas d'écarter les difficultés, qui pouvoient être prévues, est cause que tous les membres du nouveau Congrès ne sont même pas encore nommés. L'état de New-York n'a point de sénateurs ; sa Législature divisée par l'esprit de parti et à qui il appartenait d'y pourvoir en déterminant le mode de l'élection s'est séparé sans avoir rien statué. Le Congrès y pourvoira et ce sera le premier acte de suprématie qu'il exercera sur un Etat individuel et précisément sur un de ceux qui a montré le plus d'éloignement à investir le Congrès d'une autorité qui, si elle se maintient, doit nécessairement affaiblir celle des Etats particuliers. Les représentans seront élus parce que le mode de l'Election est déterminé par la Constitution fédérale, mais on ne connoitra les résultats des élections qu'à la fin de ce mois. Le Jersey et le Massachussets même sont incomplets. La Georgie est si éloignée qu'on n'est même pas exactement informé des progrès des élections.

Tant de négligence n'annonce pas un concours unanime aux mesures dont on a espéré la régénération de la prospérité publique. Il est difficile de juger comment un corps, dont les membres n'ont pas le même esprit parviendra à effectuer le bien que l'accord le plus parfait dans le Congrès ne pourroit procurer qu'avec le plus grand bonheur.

observation sur l'ancien
et le nouveau Congrès.

J'ai crû devoir vous faire connoître, Monseigneur, la fin d'un corps qui a joui par un concours singulier de circonstances et à la faveur de son grand éloignement de la partie de la terre qui seule s'occupoit avant la révolution Américaine de la voix de la renommée d'une réputation et d'une admiration, auxquelles il a bien mal répondu. Le début du corps qui le remplace ne m'a pas paru moins intéressant à constater. Si ce Colosse enfant s'élève, se fortifie et se maintient on reviendra avec intérêt sur ses commencemens. Si les vastes espérances des Américains ne sont point réalisées, ils ne recueilleront point le tribut général d'admiration qu'ils se donnent déjà à eux-mêmes et que d'après les événemens antérieurs et le sort de leur premier Gouvernement tant exalté on est très fondé à tenir encore en réserve. Si le corps formé par l'union Américaine acquierre de la vigueur, je dirai qu'il n'étoit que dérangé par des maladies guérissables. S'il ne sort pas de sa langueur je le regarderai comme gangrené et j'envisagerai sa dissolution. Les faits nous instruiront de la nature des maux, dont nous voyons les effets et nous feront apprécier la qualité des remèdes qu'on se dispose à employer.

Je suis avec respect

Monseigneur,

Votre très humble et très obéissant serviteur

LE C^{te} DE MOUSTIER.

2. *A Letter of Noah Webster to Daniel Webster, 1834.*

For the following letter the REVIEW is indebted to Mr. Worthington Chauncey Ford, of Washington, D. C. The original letter is in his possession.

NEW HAVEN, Sept. 6. 1834

Sir,

I understand by the public prints that you have been charged with saying, "Let Congress take care of the rich, the rich will take care of the poor." In reply to a letter from Mr. Brooks of Portland, you have contradicted the statement, by which it appears to be false and groundless. I confess, Sir, I am mortified that the propagation of such a calumny, and its reception by a portion of the people, should make it necessary for a gentleman of your character to deny the charge. I am

mortified that men can be found, in this country, *weak* enough to suppose you, or any respectable man, capable of the meanness which could dictate such a declaration, or *wicked* enough to propagate it, knowing it to be false. Yet it is not improbable our country contains multitudes of persons who may fall under both descriptions.

But, Sir, this is only a different form of expression, which I have known to be used, for more than half a century, to discredit the best men that ever adorned the councils of the United States. My age carries back my recollections farther than yours. In the year 1783, I commenced, as a political writer, a vindication of the measures of the Old Congress, in favor of the army. To make good the losses of the army by receiving depreciated bills in payment of their wages, and preventing a dissolution of the army, Congress granted to the officers half pay for life; which grant, to appease the popular clamor against *pensions*, was afterwards commuted for five years full pay. This grant roused an opposition among the more jealous republicans of that day, which agitated all New England, but was most violent in Connecticut, in which state it came near to cause a revolution. So unreasonable was this spirit of opposition, that the officers of the patriotic army, most of whom were nearly beggared by the loss of their wages, were represented as having enriched themselves by the war of the revolution. They were denounced as *rich* men and *aristocrats*, who had raised themselves to affluence upon the distresses of the people. The same low jealousy which now denounces the bank as a moneyed aristocracy, and rich men as the enemies of the poor, then assailed the brave men who hazarded their lives and property to defend their country, and to whom, under providence, the slanderers were indebted for their liberties, and to whom we owe the independence of the United States.¹

At that period, and after the present constitution of the U States went into operation, I devoted four or five years almost exclusively to the vindication of the measures of ² Congress and of the administration of Washington. My employment made it necessary for me to read all the public prints, and of course, to observe all the forms in which the popular jealousy appeared, and all the artifices of the opposers of Washington's administration, who were originally *anti-federalists*, and who, with one heart and all their influence opposed the adoption of the constitution. This party afterward took the title of *republican* or *democratic*, as being less odious than *antifederal*, and with equal unanimity, opposed the policy of General Washington, during his whole administration.

As early as the year 1783 or 1784, I became acquainted with the practice of exciting popular odium against public men, by propagating slanderous reports similar, in spirit, to that which you have contradicted.

¹ See also Noah Webster, *A Collection of Papers on Political, Literary and Moral Subjects* (New York, 1843), 316-321. ED.

² For some time he wrote for the *Connecticut Courant*. He later, 1793, established in New York the *American Minerva*, subsequently the *New York Commercial Advertiser*. ED.

The most common slander was that "*A B says the times will never be good, till the poor man is obliged to eat sheep's head and pluck; or a sheep's head and pluck are good enough for poor people.*" In the year 1783, when the opposers of the *commutation* act of Congress combined to dismiss, from the council, the members who had conducted us through the revolution, and who sustained the measures of congress, this slanderous report was circulated against the Hon. Oliver Wolcott of Litchfield, afterward governor of Connecticut, the first governor of that name. The slander had such effect in diminishing his popularity in Litchfield county, that had not the members of that body been chosen by the voters of the whole state, he would have lost his election. Yet from an acquaintance with that gentleman, I can affirm, there was not a more firm whig or upright and patriotic republican in the state.

The same or similar calumnies were circulated against other eminent statesmen. as against the Huntingtons in Norwich. Indeed I have frequently heard the same story told, with little variation for more than fifty years. It is revived, whenever an independent statesman, is to be driven from the public councils by a rival, or by popular jealousy.

You see then that the slanderous story which you have contradicted, is only a *new form* of an *old calumny*, proceeding from the same spirit of jealousy, which is as common as it is ill-founded.

That the poor should envy the rich, even when poverty is the effect of their own idleness and vices, is very natural; as it is immoral and absurd. What would become of the poor without the rich? How would they subsist, without employment, and how could they be employed, without the capital of the rich?

Who but the wealthy can pay the public expenses? Who can furnish the capital for canals, and railroads, and all other public improvements? The poor, without the aid of the wealthy, would *perish* or be doomed to the life of savages. The rich want the labor of the poor, and the poor must have the support of the rich. There is a mutual dependence, which ought to make the two classes *friends* to each other; and any attempt to make the poor hate the rich is of all the *low tricks* of demagogues the *meanest*, and *most detestable*.

The disposition to defame and libel political opponents is a rampant evil in the United States, and a proof of deep depravity. It appeared soon after the treaty of peace in 1783 had removed the dangers of the country; but broke out in all its violence in the attempts to turn the tide of popular favor from Gen. Washington and his federal friends, in 1793 and 1794.

When the French commenced the reform of their government, the people of this country generally felt a deep interest in their success; and it was hoped and believed that the French would establish a *republican government*, which many of our citizens have thought to be synonymous with a *free government*—an opinion not always verified by facts. When the French Minister Genet arrived in the United States, for the purpose of engaging this country in the war in union with France, a majority of

our citizens, certainly a majority in some of the States, wished that his intentions might be realized. They were ready and urgent to have our government join with France in the *war against tyrants*. The policy of Gen. Washington resisted this disposition; he foresaw the danger of such an alliance, which might involve this country in interminable evils; he determined, if possible, to preserve peace; and his *popularity alone* enabled him to effect his purpose. Nothing but his *personal influence* prevented the success of Genet; but it was doubtful, for several months, whether Washington or Genet should determine the policy of the United States.

At this time the antifederal party adhered to the policy of the French Minister; and raised loud clamors against President Washington, who was denounced as a partisan of Great Britain, and his federal council and supporters were charged with an undue partiality for monarchy. Two newspapers,¹ one published in Philadelphia and the other in New York, took the lead in traducing Washington and his policy; and never ceased till he left the administration. In the period, between 1793 and 1797, I am persuaded the slanders and misrepresentations published in those papers would amount to the contents of a large octavo volume.

The freedom of the press is a valuable privilege; but the abuse of it, in this country, is a frightful evil. The licentiousness of the press is a deep stain upon the character of the country; and in addition to the evil of calumniating good men, and giving a wrong direction to public measures, it corrupts the people by rendering them insensible to the value of truth and of reputation. Party spirit, indulged to excess has a similar effect, as bigotry in religion, and to blast the reputation of a political adversary, who stands in the way of success, is to do God service. What extreme virulence of partisan malevolence must that have been which could denounce, as traitors to their country, a Washington and a Jay, men of as pure integrity and patriotism, as ever trod the soil of America! But see the proof. In August 1795; the following paragraph appeared in a gazette published in Richmond, Virginia, by one Davis.

“Notice is hereby given, That in case the treaty entered into by that d—d archtraitor J—n J—y, with the British tyrant, should be ratified, a petition will be presented to the next General Assembly of Virginia, their next session, praying that the said state *may recede from the Union*, and be left under the government and protection of *One hundred thousand free and independent Virginians*.

P. S. As it is the wish of the people of the said State to enter into a treaty of amity, commerce and navigation with any other state or states of the present union, who are averse to returning again under the galling yoke of Great Britain: The printers of the (at present) United States, are requested to publish the above notification.”²

¹ Probably the *Aurora* and the *New York Daily Gazette*. ED.

² See also Noah Webster, *A Collection of Papers on Political, Literary and Moral Subjects* (New York, 1843), 325. ED.

This denunciation was published before the writer knew that President Washington had signed and completed the ratification of the treaty.

But the treaty was ratified and went into operation; and notwithstanding all the French partisans, or democratic party had opposed its ratification, in every way, except by the use of physical force, the treaty proved to be not only the means of preserving peace and amity, with Great Britain, but in a commercial view, it was found to be the best treaty we ever had with a foreign power. Its expiration at the end of ten years was extremely regretted.¹

Now attend to the manner in which the same party treated the great and good Washington.

On the 4th day of March 1797, the day after the last term of Washington's administration expired, the following paragraph appeared in the *Aurora*, the principal paper which had vilified that excellent man for several years.

"Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation," was the pious ejaculation of a man who beheld a flood of happiness rushing in upon mankind. If ever there was a time that would license the reiteration of the exclamation, that time has now arrived; for the man who is the source of all the misfortunes of our country is this day reduced to a level with his fellow citizens, and is no longer possessed of power to multiply evils, upon the United States. If there was ever a period for rejoicing, this is the moment; every heart, in unison with the freedom and happiness of the people, ought to beat high with exultation, that the name of Washington, from this day, ceases to give a currency to political iniquity and to legalize corruption. A new era is now opening upon us; an era which promises much to the people; for public measures must now stand upon their own merits, and nefarious projects can no longer be supported by a name. When a retrospect is taken of the Washingtonian administration for eight years, it is a subject of the greatest astonishment, that a single individual should have cankered the principles of republicanism in an enlightened people, just emerged from the gulf of despotism, and should have carried his designs against the public liberty so far, as to have put in jeopardy its very existence. Such however are the facts, and with these staring us in the face, this day ought to be a jubilee in the United States."²

Is there any way, Sir, to restrain this spirit of slander, which is continually pouring forth libels and defamatory reports against the most intelligent, upright and consistent republican citizen? Must any man and every man, who boldly supports the constitution, according to its true principles, be subjected to insult, and degradation, from intriguers and violent party men? Is there no reward but reproach and infamy, for the purest motives and noblest actions that ever adorn the character of men? I have observed this spirit of calumny and misrepresentation for half a century; I have examined the motives from which it springs, I have seen its effects; and instead of deriving any hopes of reformation from

¹*Ibid.*, 179-224. Ed.

²Bache, at that time the editor of the *Aurora*, was the writer of this article. See my *Spurious Letters attributed to Washington*, 158, note. W. C. F.

the supposed increasing intelligence of the people, recent facts continually occurring have confirmed my apprehensions that the evil admits of no effectual remedy. Some amendments of the constitution may perhaps abate the evil, by restraining the ambition of office-seekers; but the evil seems to be inseparable from frequent popular elections.

This practice of libeling political opponents, will often drive the best men from public stations, or prevent them from accepting offices; it will generate the most violent animosities between men who have a common interest in the public welfare, and a common attachment to republican forms of government; it will sometimes degrade or render odious the *good*, and exalt the *bad* to popularity and to offices of *honor*, which they will *dishonor* by their vices or their weakness. Many of our public evils may be traced to *deception* practiced upon the people, by calumny and misrepresentations. A majority of our citizens have, in some cases, been wholly mistaken in the characters and designs of their favorite leaders, as well as in the true policy of their measures. Some of these mistakes will last during the present generation; others may be dissipated by the public mischief which they produce.

Of mistakes which pervade a large portion of the community, several instances may be mentioned; but I shall specify one instance only, which is often a theme of declamation and abuse: this is a misapprehension of the origin and design of the Hartford Convention.¹ I mention this, because I was personally concerned, in the origination of it, and am acquainted with every measure that preceded it, and with the men who were the authors of it. I am the more inclined to state the circumstances of its origin, as they seem not to have been known to those who have written in vindication of the measure.

The Hartford Convention in 1814 has been represented as having for its object a dissolution of the Union: and continued attempts have been made to vilify the men who composed the convention, and thus to destroy their political influence. I *know* the charge against the men concerned in the origin and prosecution of that convention, to be *false*.

The facts respecting the origin of that convention are these. A number of Gentlemen in Northampton, in the county of Hampshire, taking into consideration the distresses of the country, occasioned by the war, and embargo, judged it advisable to invite a meeting of some of the more influential men in the neighboring towns, for the purpose of conversing on the subject, and adopting some measures to manifest the sentiments of the people to the legislature at their approaching session. The result of this conference was, that one of the gentlemen addressed a letter dated January 5, 1814, to several gentlemen in the neighboring towns, requesting them to meet at Northampton on the 19th of that month, "for the purpose of a free and dispassionate discussion touching our public concerns"; stating also that the legislature which was soon to meet, would probably be gratified to know the feelings and wishes of the people. That letter is now before me.

¹ Cf. Webster, *A Collection of Papers, etc.*, 311-315. ED.

In compliance with that request, several gentlemen met, and after a free conversation on the calamities of the country, they appointed a committee to prepare a circular address to the several towns in the three counties, Hampshire, Hampdon and Franklin, called the Old county of Hampshire. A printed copy of that address is now before me. The chief complaints urged in this address, against the measures of Congress, are the unconstitutionality of the embargo, the distresses resulting from the interruption of our commerce, and the inequality of the representation of the commercial states in Congress. The following are the concluding paragraphs of that circular.

"We forbear to enumerate all the measures of the federal government, which we consider a violation of the constitution and encroachments on the rights of the people, and which bear particularly hard upon the commercial people of the north. But we would invite our fellow citizens to consider, whether peace will remedy our public evils, without some amendments of the constitution, which shall secure to the Northern States, their due weight and influence in our national councils."

"The Northern States acceded to the representation of slaves, as a matter of compromise, upon the express stipulation in the constitution, that they should be protected in the enjoyment of their commercial rights. These stipulations have been repeatedly violated, and it cannot be expected that the Northern States should be willing to bear their proportion of the burdens of the federal government, without enjoying the benefits stipulated."

"If our fellow citizens should concur with us in opinion, we would suggest, whether it would not be expedient *for the people in town meetings to address memorials to the General Court at their present session, petitioning that honorable body to propose a convention of all the Northern and Commercial States, by delegates to be appointed by their respective legislatures*, to consult upon measures in concert, for procuring such alterations in the federal constitution as will give to the Northern States a due proportion of representation, and secure them from the future exercise of powers injurious to their commercial interests; or if the general court shall see fit, that they would pursue such other course, as they in their wisdom shall deem best calculated to effect the objects. The measure is of such magnitude that we apprehend a concert of states will be useful, and even necessary to procure the amendments proposed; and should the people of the several towns concur in this opinion, it would be expedient to act on the subject without delay."

At the time of this meeting I was not a member of the legislature; but I was chosen in the April following.

In compliance with the proposal in this circular, several town meetings were held. In Northampton, a town meeting was held on the 25th of January, in which it was voted to address a memorial to the legislature then in session, on the subject of the public evils. In this memorial, the town prayed the legislature to take measures to obtain amendments to the constitution, *either by a convention of delegates from the Northern and commercial States*, or in such other way as should be judged suitable.

At a town meeting in Hatfield, held on the 28th of January, a memorial of a like tenor was addressed to the General Court, and this con-

tained a like request for a *meeting of delegates from the Northern States* for the same purposes.

A town meeting was held in Deerfield on the 10th of January, which voted a memorial to the General Court, in which the inhabitants petitioned that body to take energetic measures for a redress of grievances.

A town meeting was held in Amherst on the third of January, and resolutions were passed, enumerating the distresses of the country, and directing the representatives of the town in the General Court, to take the most vigorous measures to put an end to a hopeless war.

These applications were made to the legislature then in session, but as negotiations were then on foot for concluding a treaty of peace with Great Britain, it was judged advisable to postpone any action on them during that Session.

But the negotiation was protracted during the following summer; the affairs of the country grew worse; our shipping was dismantled and perishing in our harbors; the public treasury was exhausted; the banks south and west of New England had suspended specie payments; the coast of Connecticut was blockaded by British ships; a part of Maine was in possession of a British force; and the whole coast of New England was left without any adequate defense. Canada had been invaded and abandoned; battles had been fought on land without any advantage to the cause; and excepting the triumphant victories of our frigates, nothing but loss and calamity attended a prosecution of the war.

These circumstances induced Governor Strong to summon a special Session of the General Court in October 1814. At this session, the convention was proposed. I was present when the proposal was made, and when it was debated in the House of Representatives. I believed then as I still believe that the measure was justified by the exigencies of that crisis, and that it had a beneficial effect. The spirit displayed on that occasion must have had a beneficial effect in checking the audacious tyranny which subjected us to the most wanton violations of the constitution in prosecuting an unnecessary and fruitless war—a war that cost the United States a hundred millions of dollars and thirty thousand lives, *without gaining one object* for which it was undertaken. I then considered, and I still consider a combination of the commercial States to recover their rights, and restore the business of the country to its usual channels, as important and as legitimate, as the Union of the Colonies in 1774 to resist the oppressive measures of Great Britain.

The proceedings and result of the Convention are before the public. They were such as to do honor to the members of that patriotic body, and would do honor to the ablest council ever assembled in America. The treaty of peace which soon followed superceded further proceedings.

It will be observed that the first proposals for a convention proceeded from the *people in their primary assemblies*. Not one person in Boston had any concern in those proposals. That the members of the convention, or any of the persons who suggested the resort to a convention, had any views unfriendly to the Union of the States, is a gross calumny,

originating in mere surmise and party jealousy. I heard all that was said at the meeting in Northampton, and at the meeting when the convention was proposed in Boston, and in the debates on the resolution in the House of Representatives; and can affirm that the charges against the convention and those who proposed it, of designs against the constitution, are utterly false and groundless. The object of the people and the measures of the convention were, in my view, as *lawful*, as *constitutional* and as *honorable*, as any that ever characterized the councils of any public body in this country. I knew *all* the gentlemen who first met to consult on the subject; I knew *most* of the members of the convention, and with many of them, I had been intimately acquainted for twenty or thirty years; I have been acquainted with many members of every Congress for more than fifty years, and I can affirm with confidence that no body of men, of the like number, ever convened in this country, have combined more talents, purer integrity, sounder patriotism and republican principles, or more firm attachment to the constitution of the United States, than the gentlemen who composed the Convention.

The history of this convention, Sir, presents full proof that party spirit may impose misrepresentations, upon a *whole people*, and mislead a great portion of them into *opinions directly contrary to facts*. Other instances may be mentioned, which have been equally injurious to the reputation of our best citizens, and even more pernicious to the public welfare. But let this example suffice.

Accept, Sir, the assurances of the high esteem and respect of

Your Obed^t Servt

N WEBSTER.

[*Endorsement* :] Letter to Daniel Webster Sept. 6. 1834

I sent this Letter to M^r Webster, without taking a copy — I afterward requested him to return it — which he did after taking a copy for himself.

N WEBSTER.

3. *A Journey from New York to San Francisco in 1850.*

THE following document is a portion of a diary of David Knapp Pangborn, which was kindly furnished to the REVIEW by his granddaughter, Mrs. Winthrop Girling of Chicago, Illinois, in whose possession the original diary now is. The portions of the diary recounting the experiences of the writer after his arrival in San Francisco are not given here, inasmuch as they refer almost exclusively to personal matters without much historical interest.

June 1, 1850. New York.

Left our Dock at 3 P. M. precisely amid the cheers and greetings of thousands which crowded every possible standing place on the pier with one thick mass of human beings.

June 3. At sea.

For the first time since I left N. Y. I have attempted with success to eat a little and keep it down. . . . At 4 P. M. on Sunday had a Prayer meeting on the main Deck got up by 3 Cali Missionaries (Baptists) going out. Two of them have wives on Board, one is single and a single Lady is also going as a Teacher. . . . My tea and sea biscuit begin to relish and the confinement of the Cabin to be irksome.

June 7.

Too Hot to sleep. Thermometer 85 in shade. Came up on deck. . . . We are now fairly in the Carribean Sea. Verry hot indeed scarce a breath of air and our overcrowded Ship is almost breathless. If we find it warm on the Istmas we shall at least have more room.

Sunday, June 9.

Land. Coasted along the shore for several hours till we finally cast anchor of Chagres at 10 A. M. At 3 P. M. got safe to Shore in small row Boats.

June 10.

Hired a Canoe with 2 others beside W^m and the Doctor and started at 1 P. M. Began immediately to Rain and we put back. Our Boatman deserted and left us alone in the rain which was Rain *Pouring* for an hour and a half. Got our Baggage all wet and at 8, we verry gladly crossed over by the vivid flashes of Lightning to the American side of the River and took shelter in a Hotel under the imposing name of the Irving House. Paid a \$1.25 cash for Supper and Lodging. Supper Cider and Biscuit. Lodging a Cot and Blanket stowed in the unfurnished chamber as thick as they could be stowed. Soon fell asleep notwithstanding the heat and rested.

June 11.

8 A. M. Got a cup of coffee without milk at a Negros Stand which with a soda Biscuit made my Breakfast. With much ado got our Negro Boatmen and Baggage once more on Board and started. River rising — Banks low and swampy. Made 10 miles by hard labor and stoped for Dinner. Got more black rily Coffee and eat sea Bread. At 3 succeeded in getting our Darkies once more into the Boat and started. Made 10 miles more and landed at 8 P. M. Verry dark. Found an "Amerecano" with a tent who for the consideration of 50 cts each suffered us to sleep on the ground under his Tent. Supper Coffee and Bread.

June 12.

Started early after getting some Coffee and worked up a few miles. Current getting verry strong and River rising. Stoped at 10 A. M. at a tent and for 2 hours another Rain *Pouring*. Never saw anything compare with it. After a delay of some hours a great deal of scolding and working succeeded in getting our Negros off by the promise of \$5.00 extra pay. Started at 3 P. M. and made a few miles. Stoped at 5 at a

Native Ranch. Got into a Hen House and opened our trunks. Found to our dismay that almost every thing we had was wet. Wrung out our wet things as well as we could and hung them up till Morning. Went to a neighboring House and bought a little Coffee. Got some boiled Rice and made a Supper. Spread our Coats on some dry Hydes in the loft of the Hen House and slept well.

June 14.

More Coffee and Rice. Paid 4 Dimes each for the use of the Hen House and after an other long long spell of Coaxing succeeded at 11 A. M. in getting off. River rose during the night 10 or 12 feet and before we started had fallen again for about 5 or 6 of it. Current verry strong and navigation verry difficult. Could make with all our exertion only about one mile an hour. At 4 P. M. reached San Pablo, a Rancho on the right Bank of the River on a high Bluff and looking more like life than any thing we had seen. The Rancho is owned by a Spaniard who is almost as great a proficient at speaking as "Los Americanos" themselves. Wanted to charge us 6 Dimes apiece for Sleeping on the mud floor of his Hovel. Left him and went back some 30 Rods and made a tent of our Blankets boiled some rice bought a little coffee at a dime a cup and camped down. All soon forgot in sleep the toils of the day but myself. I got up and with the long Knife of our Boat Man in hand kept gaurd over [?] our little camp . . . and after a few hours of reflection and meditation at about 12 I lay down on my Blanket and got an hour or two of unquiet slumber.

June 15.

Got some more Coffee and sea Bread eat some cold rice and started. Toiled on till 3 P. M. with only a short rest at a Negro hut and reached "Gorgona." Got Supper at a "Hotel" with a large Name but slim accomodations and went down to the Boat. Opened all our trunks and Bags and spread every thing out in the hot Sun on the gravel Beach which was covered for nearly a Mile by Men all laboreing like us to get dry clothing. Found some of our things quite spoiled and others nearly so by the moisture and Heat. In fact every thing you touch seems wet and once wet *nothing drys* but mould ensues immediately. By close application got our things in tolerable order and repacked by sunset. Dare not trust our negroes with the Boat tonight. Some done so last night and found themselves deserted after paying as we had done fare all the way through and this morning at San Pablo paid \$10.00 each to get through, as much as we paid for the whole distance from Chagres to Cruces. Two of our party slept in the Boat, and two, the Doctor and myself at the "Rail Road Hotel" paying 75 cts for Supper and 50 for Lodging.

June 16.

All still well and at an early hour were under way. River almost impassable. Saw last night the Rapid Current of the River filled with Boxes and trunks of a capsized Boat which were mostly picked up in the Eddy opposite Gorgona. It proved to be the Goods of a German from

Utica N. Y. The owner was drowned. After an hour or two we came up to the place where the unfortunate German lost his life. A verry rapid place and the Boatmen loosing control of the Boat it was dashed against a snag or sunken tree and capsized. Several other fellows are said to have been drowned dureing the last few days. We saw 2 or 3 Floating Bodies in the River but did not learn who they were. Worked our way up till the last Mile. We were repeatedly obliged to get out on the gravelly bars of the River and walk past the rapid places while the Boatmen waded in the water and shoved the Boat and Baggage up. Arrived at Cruces at 2 P. M. all safe. Had another time drying our clothes and deposited them in a transportation office.

Sabbath, June 16.

Lounged out the day in a large tent belonging to an american. Went up to see the ruins of the old Church and made our arrangement for a start in the morning for Panama.

June 18.

Got a cup of coffee and started on foot. Found the Road not as muddy as we had been led to expect but all the descriptions of tourists had failed to give up the first faint idea of it as it is except the general one that it was difficult. It has once been a paved mule road cut through the Mountains at great expense but with the ancient Glory of Panama is in complete ruins. A small patch here and there just serves to show the fact of its previous existance. The old paving stones and other boulders lie in complete confusion over the whole surface of a large part of the Road, interspersed with occasional patches of deep mud. When it is stones the unlucky wayfarer must jump and when it is mud he must wade, for there is no dodging either, it being impossible to get out of the Road let what will be in it in the way of difficulty. A large part of the distance is made up of cuts in the Road of various depths from a few feet up to twenty or more about 10 feet wide at the top and in many places not 2 wide at the Bottom and some not even so wide filled at the bottom with the aforesaid stones and mud interspersed with here and there a dead Mule by way of variety, now suppose it to be up and down at every possible grade and crooked at every possible radius of curvature, fill it well up with pack mules and naked Negro Muleteers each with a long knife in his belt and perhaps with a trunk weighing 100 lbs or more on his shoulders and cover the whole with an impenetrable mop of foliage in Tropical Luxuriance and fill the air there with the constant screaming of parrots and you have the Cruces Road as we saw it. We leaped from stone to stone and waded in mud forded brawling brooks held our noses and crawled over dead mules most perseveringly from 7 till 2 when we came in sight of the far famed "Half Way House" a miserable tent pitched on the bank of a Brook completely covered with the Mould which covers all cloth coverings here in the wet season. No seat to sit on. Cot Beds from 75 cts to 100 each. Meals 100 and no refreshment of any sort to be had in any other form or at any other

price. It was "Hobsons choice" that or nothing. 2 of my Comrades refused to be [illegible] and went on, myself and [illegible] thought best to submit and stay washed the mud as well as we could from our Boots dried them, rested ourselves got some supper and in the morning went on.

June 19. Panama.

Arrived quite worn out at 12 M. having got a cup of coffee after a walk of 4 miles this morning. Whole distance from Cruces 22 Miles, 11 yesterday and 11 today. This end of the Road much the best, being dryer and more open the air had a better chance for circulation. Found the Doctor after an hour or two and took lodgings without the City Walls right on the Shore of the Bay in the third story of an old building said to be 100 years old. I never understood before why the upper-part of a House was the place of honor in old times in the East. I would not live below here on any account, but away up in our Attic we are cool and clean when they are suffering with heat and all sorts of offensive smells below. Have got us some Hammocks slung for sleeping and get sometimes a meal at the Restaraunts and sometimes cook a little ourselves. Pay a Dime pr day for Room Rent and Lounge away our time as we can. The Northern is not yet heard from and don't know when she will be.

Sunday, June 23.

Saw Hager and Bennett and White . . . all familiar faces. Hager and Bennett say the boat we should have taken is already gone.

At 11 A. M. a sermon preached in the Tent of a Circus Company here from N. Y. by a traveling clergyman a verry small pattern of a man but nevertheless the voice of prayer and Praise, instead of Blasphemy and impiety is refreshing . . . however poorly it may be done. Gambling and swearing is the order of the day here on every hand. Recovering slowly from the fatigue of my Journey.

June 24.

White and one or two others left to day paying \$50. difference between their Tickets and others after waiting here 8 weeks. Am no wise sorry they are gone. Society here can be made no worse by their absence and may be made better.

June 25.

Steamer Oregon arrived from San Francisco. Brought news of the Sarah Sands which has been due here for 6 or 8 weeks. She will not be here for 10 days or a fortnight yet. Some of her passengers have died. Many well have been sick, some have gone home discouraged and many more have procured other tickets and gone on. I think that 8 weeks in this climate will "decimate" a lot of passengers. 2 American funerals to day, one Man and one woman a Mrs Hardy. She has left a Husband here and a young child. It would have been mercifull to his family had he thrown them into the sea at New York instead of bringing them here

to die by inches in this climate and among strangers destitute as all must be whether sick or well of the commonest comforts of life. It is no place for women and children. If men please to come let them.

June 26.

British Steamer arrived from Valparaiso this morning, bringing no news of our boat.

June 27.

Rose early this morning and went into the Mountains back of the City. . . . had some fine views of the country about and returned at 12 M. by the way of the Burying Ground. Saw the place where a good many disappointed Californians have taken up their last sleep, a wild neglected place outside the Catholic yard in the Bushes and trees. . . . I looked at the desolate looking place and thought of the chances I stood of taking my place among these with now no very comfortable feeling. But the will of God be done. I left home not for my own good but for the benefit of those at home. This end may be subserved perhaps as well by my dying here as by going on. Every day however we hold a council and talk over every expedient of escape from here and invariably end right where we began. There seems no way of escape for us without more funds than we have to spare so we must resign our lives and wait, as patiently as possible.

Almost every night is a Fandango at a Negro Gambling House near by kept up no body knows how long. The dull monotony of the African Drum is only relieved at intervals of the dance by the drunken yells and screams of Darkies and Dinahs in the exuberance of their joy and at all times by night and by Day we have all sorts of noises of our own among ourselves. Card Playing, singing either Negro Melodies or Methodist Hymns as the case chances to be, and all mixed in complete confusion with the most foul and foolish Blasphemy from lips that might be expected to use decent language.

I am constantly seeing things here to remind one of Eastern scenery and eastern cities. Not only is the Palm Tree that significant symbol of eastern vegetation abundant, but much in the habits of the people and in the city itself is also like the East. The streets of Panama are narrow and all are paved. The Main Street is about 30 feet wide and remainder perhaps 20 feet. A narrow sidewalk is flagged on each side in a rude manner and the paving is made with a slight decent to the middle of the street. The Houses are all made with galleries in the second and third stories projecting over the sidewalk from 3 to 6 feet and the roof has the same projection so that the sun is nearly shut out from the streets. The most of the Buildings are of stone and very old, some few are being repaired, but a new House of any kind is not known. Many are falling to ruins.

It is a very common thing to see Buildings gone completely to decay, Churches and private Houses unroofed and fallen in, some with all the side walls still standing, some with only one side up, and the rest all

down. I think in its best days this city never had any aqueducts or any decent water. It is now supplied by water brought some distance on the backs of Mules and costs about 5 cts per gall and is the poorest water I have seen even here on the Isthmus. The principle well would not be offered as a respectable watering place for animals at home. The roofs are all covered with Tiles and the Floors of stone Houses are made of the same material only differing in form, but the houses so far as I can learn are all infested with insects and reptiles, many of them venomous. Scorpions a large kind of spider looking thing with a tail about 2 inches long is quite poisonous and a small Lizard shaped animal said also to be poisonous is very common. We see them every day crawling all over the walls and timbers above though they seem shy and run from us. The Bread of Panama is the most like Human food of any thing that is here, it is pretty good made of Chilian or Peruvian Flour and is only about double, or a little more than double the price in N. York. Beef miserable 10 cts per pound, pork not quite so bad 20 cts at the market, Fish dear, for no reason that I can learn except they are too lazy to take them. Many of them are very good. Sugar about double the price in the States and poor. This is the only place I ever saw where no attempts whatever are made at cultivation. I have not seen in the whole country any thing worthy of the name of Cultivation, every thing is brought from somewhere else even Bananas and the spontaneous productions of the earth are brought here in boats from along the coast toward Peru and many if not all the few eadible vegetables used here come from Peru, Flour, Potatoes, Apples, etc. etc. Potatoes are 10 cts per pound and other things in proportion. A large portion of the meat used is salt ham brought I should think from the States and sells for 4 dimes (50 cts) per pound.

June 29.

This morning while getting our coffee ready heard that a man had been stabbed during the night near by. Proved to be a Gambler and supposed to be killed by a Brother Black Leg for his money. He had been lucky for a number of days and was known to have several hundred Dollars. His money Belt was found by his side ripped open and Robbed. He was a white man but not an American. Only the day before in a Gambling brawl had staved and badly wounded another man. No notice is taken of the affair here by the Authorities if indeed there are any Authorities here, of which I see no indication except the presence of some forty or fifty Negro Soldiers barefoot and dirty and taken together the most inefficient looking Negros I have seen here. A perfect caricature of the name of Soldier. Nobody minds any thing about them and nobody so far as I have been able to learn ever dreams of appealing to the city government for justice in any case whatever.

Sabbath, June 30.

Attended Protestant service. Preaching by the same stranger that preached last Sabbath . . . to a large congregation.

July 4.

In Panama still and no prospect of relief. Great preparations are made up in the city for a celebration of the day. The Governor has offered the use of His House and has ordered it would seem an extra guard from somewhere for the occasion. A steamer is in the port under our window dressed in all the colors of the Rain Bow ready to carry those who have more Dimes and Patriotism than Brains to somewhere in the hot sun. I have to stay at home and save my breath to Hurra for the Northern should I be so happy as ever to see Her come. She is now 86 days out.

A chapter on Steamboats.

4 July, 1850.

I have learned what I can of the steamer business since I have been here and found it on the whole the most stupendous fraud of the age. Tickets are issued and sold by thousands in N. Y. and the Identical Money paid for them by the deluded Purchasers is Taken and Boats purchased with it and sent round the Horn while the robbed passengers have purchased instead of a "Through Ticket" a certificate of *certain detention* here. Many got sick, some die and many are discouraged after weeks and months of delay and broken in fortune or constitution or both goes back discouraged entirely. I. Howard and Son and Roberts Lines have neither of them any certain means of forwarding from here one fifth part of the passengers they catch in their "Man Trap."

Roberts and Co [?] have 2 Boats here but only one of them has yet made more than one trip up while they are sending on passengers for the 3d trip that must stay here till Sept if not Oct.

Howards Line have got no Boat running with any sort of regularity on this side. They have been selling through Tickets since last Feb'y and have only the Sarah Sands here which went up on her first Trip!! actually only Her first Trip. She left here the 9th of Apl for San Francisco and has not yet returned and this is the *only load* of passengers Howard and Son have ever sent up. She was heard from a few days ago near Monterey going up. The Passengers had got tired of waiting for Her and landing walked up the Coast 150 miles and Sent Back a lighter load of Coal to the poor Boat to help Her up. In the mean time the passengers for Her second trip are here waiting for Her 8 or 9 weeks unless by great Sacrifices they have got on some other way. The passengers for the New Orleans Have I think mostly got wearied out and disposed of their Tickets in some way and dispersed. The "West Point" is thought to be lost and the "Northern" which was to have been here without doubt in 70 days is now out 86 and not heard from. People get Here and have paid their money in New York unsuspectingly thinking they shall go on and find when they get Here that their further progress is "Indefinitely Postponed" or they are subjected to the tender mercy of a "Ticket Gambler" Instead of whom commend me to an Algerian slave dealer.

Many an unlucky wight has paid them more money as a bonus on a Ticket than the original cost of the Ticket in New York. They cry down [?] the owners of the non appearing Boats and buy up the Tickets of the wearied passengers and send them back home or up on Sailing Vessels and then when the Boat comes sell the Tickets at double and more than double prices and the very agents of the lines themselves are shamefully engaged in thus plucking their poor Emigrants.

Saturday, July 13, 1850.

West Point arrived round the Horn yesterday and the Columbus this morning from California but no "Northern" yet for us. More [?] American funerals yesterday and no escape open for us. "Though He slay me yet will I trust in Him." It is my Father. Let Him do what Seemeth Him good. Prayer Meeting last night and Prayer precious to me. It is an affecting and pleasant sight to see Strong Men with nerve to do and suffer what we are doing suffering and engaged as all here must be and expect to continue to be engaged in a struggle not only with difficulties but in a contest stern and strong with the selfishness of men. To see such men in the childlike Simplicity of true Christian feeling melted to tears under the influence of the spoken [?] truth, Christian truth and prayer. But so it is and when we meet each other after those interviews it is with a more cordial feeling of recognition and a far kindlier shake of the hand.

Thursday, July 18.

The "Northern" arrived on Tuesday last. The "Republic" has also come from round the Horn and the Sarah Sands from California so that there are many happy faces in Panama and a great majority of the Emigrants will be gone from here in the course of the next ten days probably to be succeeded by fresh arrivals from home. There seems no end to the Hordes that are coming. I have not had an hour of ill health since I came on the Isthmus five weeks since. William has been ill for two weeks and the Doctor longer and seems to have lost all his self possession and energy. Hope to get away from here next Tuesday.

Sunday, July 21.

Still here in Panama and cannot foresee when we are to get off but hope to this week. Service this morning at 10 A. M. at the Home of the French Consul. The Americans here have petitioned the Governor for the use of one of the vacant churches for Protestant services. There are 15 or 16 churches and convent chapels in the City and not half of them ever used at all. Our last Friday night Prayer Meeting was broken up by the changes occurring here daily, some who had sustained it were gone while their places were filled by Men of another spirit and also by sickness in the Town. They must now be reckoned among our past opportunities [*sic*] for which we must account at the day of Judgment.

Thursday, July 25.

We expect to go on board tomorrow morning. We expect to be crowded badly and have poor accomodations. But we are glad to get

on at any rate for we are tired enough of Panama. Hope I have bought the last Picayune worth of rice of the old Negro woman at the corner and shall have to kindle but few more fires here to cook it and eat but few more meals here on the Top of my trunk. But I will not rejoice to much. I expect the fare on the Boat will make me regret even Panama.

Friday, July 26.

At 3 went on Board the Little Steamer Taboga for the Northern and ran down to the Island of Taboga. Reached there 10 miles and came on Board at 4½ P. M. Ship all in confusion.

Saturday, July 27.

The balance of our Passengers came down from Panama to day at 3 P. M. and at 6 we weighed our Anchor and stood out to sea. Ship crowded to excess between 400 and 500 Hundred Passengers and over 100 of the Crew making in all over 600 Souls on Board. In my cot tonight I reviewed once more with gratefull heart the goodness of God to me while on the Isthmus for 7 weeks in an unhealthy climate surrounded by the sick and yet not one sick hour.

Sunday, July 28.

Evening. *Sea Sick.* Oh! Oh!

29 Mondy. Do Do

Tuesday, July 30.

Not a breath of air and our crowded Ship is insufferably hot.

Saturday, August 3.

Morning. Land again in sight on the Starbord Bow. At 11 A. M. altered our course and stood in for Land and coasted up looking for the entrance of the Bay of Accapulco but did not make it till 8 P. M. It was now dark and we knew that the officers of the Boat were none of them acquainted with the Place. We had therefore to make a strange Harbor in the dark without any Pilot. Great anxiety was felt and all hands were on Deck watching the course of the Ship as she stood into the entrance between Two Headlands that rendered by their deep Shadows the passage blind and dark enough. Even "Venus" was in a cloud as we went in, but went safely up however though verry nigh the Breakers once and quite out of the regular channel and at 9 P. M. Dropt our Anchor before the City and all hearts were lightened of a load. Just as we made the entrance of the Harbor at 8 P. M. one of our number died a Mr Smith from Western N. Y. and as we turned in at 10 or 11 we heard that the "Cholera" was on Shore and that the Small Pox was on Board — rather poor things to set one to sleep.

Sunday, August 4.

What little disposition I had to sleep was defeated for the most part last night by the incoherent ravings of a young man near me who had a fever. After Breakfast all went on shore to give the crew a chance to Cleanse the Ship. Carpenter made a rough coffin for the dead man and at 10 He was carried a shore and Buried by the American curate.

Accapulco is a much cleaner and pleasanter Place than Panama. Went this morning about $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile out of the City Back to bathe in a Beautiful stream of fresh water coming right down from the High Mountains in the rear. Walked in the groves and Gardens a while and returned to Town and got Dinner.

Then went up on an elevated Plateau overlooking the Bay under a grove of Mango Trees to while away the time till night. The City is on our right a strong Mexican Fort is on the Point at our left and the Bay and Shipping right before us. The Northern being right in the Center of the Picture, covered with Her crew and all the "Hombres" that they can hire Taking in Coal and water, Cattle, Sheep and Pigs. At $4\frac{1}{2}$ took a long ramble up past the City and all around the Beach till we came to where our further progress was Bared by the shutting [?] down of the Hills so near as to close the Road. The City Lies embosomed among Volcanic Mountains Wild and Rugged as possible. In the rear is a natural [?] plain of a Mile or so before you strike the Base of the Mountains in one direction but in another the Houses of the City extend for some distance up the sides of the Hill. The Houses are all one story High and even the Church is very low being evidently made for a Volcanic Country.

Monday, August 5.

At Half past five heard the welcome sound of the parting Gun fired and we left our Anchorage with three cheers answered from the crowded decks of the Steamer Republic along side and from some other vessels and stood out of the Bay. Two more of our Sick had died while we were on shore on Sunday and were carried on shore privately and buried in the evening One the sick man who had disturbed us on Saturday night and the other a Ships Boy. Our Ship had been however well cleaned on Sunday and we hope the most of our sickness is over but we are in the Hands of God. In His hands our Breath is whose are all our ways.

As we left our anchorage in the Bay of Accapulco a storm of thunder and Rain Burst on us from the high mountains back of the City and we put to sea in the midst of the severest storm of wind and rain we have seen for many days. But our Boat is a good one and we have confidence in the good Providence of God. I slept well and rose Tuesday morning at Sea and in good health. The coast of Mexico in sight Mountainous in the extreme. Course still "West North West." Heard that while lying in the Harbor it was Stated by the passengers of the "Republic" that one of their Passengers on the way down from Panama being out of His head with Fever came on Deck unobserved by any one and before the watch on Deck observed what he was doing leaped overboard just before the wheel and of course was seen no more. I did not learn who He was but the Ship held on her way. William has been sick again and took an emetic on Saturday morning. Is better again now.

Wednesday, August 7.

By the goodness of God still well myself. One of my acquaintances from Burlington, a Mr Pine [?] removed to the Hospital (on the after Deck near my Berth) sick with Small Pox.

Thursday, August 8.

Heard from young Pine. His case proves confluent Small Pox. But inasmuch as a sail cloth curtain separates the Hospital from the cots of the Passengers we hope it will not spread so as to get us into quarantine at San Francisco.

Saturday, August 10.

Had our quarters moved to day into a less favorable spot. Caught a severe cold in my new quarters last Night and a Fray occurred between a Mr Dearborn and the first Mate about the Berths.

August 12.

Cold severe. Put on all the clothing I ever put on in winter and yet uncomfortable. My cold no better.

August 15.

Daylight off the entrance to the Bay of San Francisco.

4 P. M. Dropped our anchor at 8 A. M. Health officer came on Board and we had but one sick man on our list. The rest had all recovered or nearly so. We were permitted to land and after a long tiresome and dinnerless day of scrambling pulling and hauling succeeded in getting all safe on shore and am at the Hotel [?] waiting for supper with a good appetite.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

The History of the World. A Survey of Man's Record. Edited by Dr. H. F. HELMOLT, with an Introductory Essay by the Right Hon. JAMES BRYCE, D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S. In eight volumes. Vols. I., IV., and VII. (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company. 1902. Pp. lx, 628; xii, 590; ix, 573.)

THE plan of this new universal history marks a wide departure from the time-honored model of the familiar *Weltgeschichte*. In its scheme geography and ethnography, so far as possible, are the determining factors in the arrangement of the material so as to give proper recognition to the influence of physical environment in shaping human progress. In its apportionment of space to different peoples it is equally emancipated from the trammels of tradition. The advantages of the plan appear at their best in Volumes IV. and VII., devoted respectively to the "Mediterranean Countries" and to "Western Europe"; and its defects stand out most sharply in Volume I., which is devoted to America, and in which the Pacific Ocean is assumed as the central geographic factor. Dr. Helmolt's reasons for this as given in the preface appear to me to be trivial. It would be impossible to select for the starting-point of a universal history a geographical center that is so far from the beginning, and whose history presupposes for its proper understanding so much that has gone before as is the case with America. The objections to this arrangement of the material that occur to one are far from quieted by Dr. Helmolt's introductory essay, which is overloaded with aphorisms and generalizations from various authors, and is distinctly lacking in close and lucid argumentation. The question, however, is not vital to the merits of the work as a whole, for no one is obliged to read the first volume first.

The contents of the opening volume, waiving the question whether they all belong there, are excellent. The second chapter, by Professor Kohler of Berlin, is a general survey of the development of social, political, and religious institutions. It invites comparison with the introduction which Mr. Bryce has written for the English edition. The two are in some respects counterparts of each other, the one dealing with the internal, the other with the more external aspects of human progress, and both reflecting not only the intellectual characteristics of their authors, but in some measure also those of the German and the English mind. Next comes a compendious statement by Professor Ratzel of the principles of anthropogeography, the presentation of which in English is to be wel-

comed. Equally welcome is Professor Johannes Ranke's sketch of pre-historic culture, a masterly review of the present state of knowledge of the subject.

Nearly 400 pages of the 600 in this volume are devoted to Karl Haebler's "America." Of these 400 pages 166 are taken up with aboriginal culture and history—not too much, surely, for the Americanist; but when in Volume IV. one finds only 46 pages allotted to the history of Greece to the death of Alexander, and 135 pages to the history of Rome, he has misgivings as to the editor's real grasp of the problem and significance of human history and of the relative importance of its contributing elements. Of this part of Dr. Haebler's work I cannot speak with competence, but his great familiarity with the recent critical literature of the discoveries renders his account of that period of American history a most convenient summary of present-day accepted fact and approved conjecture. Much higher value attaches to his survey of the Spanish colonial empire, with its discussion of the *Casa de Contratacion*, the native question, the missions, trade policy, and negro slavery. On all these subjects Dr. Haebler writes from the vantage-ground of his researches in the economic history of Spain; and the section as a whole is far and away the best brief account of the Spanish colonial system accessible at present to the English reader. His account, too, of Spanish-American history is a serviceable addition to the not over-abundant scholarly treatments of the subject in English.

The fourth volume, as I have said before, exhibits in a favorable light the arrangement of the material on geographical lines; and the various contributions are excellent. Professor Rudolf von Scala of Innsbruck makes brilliant use of the limited space allotted to him for Greece. Dr. Jung has more elbow-room for his presentation of Roman history, and yet the mass of fact is too great for him to escape altogether the arid atmosphere of a summary. Both of these writers correlate with their narratives in the appropriate places the work of the ancient historians. Dr. Heinrich Schurtz in 85 pages takes a bird's-eye view of the history of the Pyrenean peninsula from the days of the primitive Iberians to the end of the Spanish-American War, a veritable *tour de force*. In spite of its merits, one must consider the space too brief for a proper treatment of the period of Spain's greatness.

The most striking essay in Volume VII. is that of Professor Richard Mayr on the "Economic Development of Western Europe" since the crusades. The opening paragraphs immediately arrest the attention by their richness of thought and their precision of definition; and the chapter as a whole is compact with interesting facts and suggestive generalizations. Another chapter in this volume that is out of the ordinary run is Dr. George Adler's review of the "Social Question," its economic causes, its problems, and its present status in the different countries of the world. The socialistic ideal, he trenchantly asserts, is an illusion, but one of those great illusions which stir inert mankind and make progress possible through the agitation of the mass. The other chapter in these

two volumes are by authors of high standing in the historical field, but do not call for especial comment in this place.

Enough has been said to indicate that the preparation of an English edition of this new *Weltgeschichte* has definitely enriched the body of historical writing in English that is abreast of modern research. In regard to the form of this edition, one may regret that the English volumes cost twice as much as the German ones and are nearly twice as heavy. If the series could have been reproduced in handy volumes, for sale separately as well as in sets, its use would have been more convenient and consequently more extended.

The work of translation may be pronounced good on the whole. The narrative is everywhere readable, and frequently one is not conscious of reading a translation. Then, again, one is brought up sharply and made suddenly conscious that he is trying to see "through a glass darkly." Obscurities of this kind and most of the errors of rendering that I shall quote could very easily have been detected by having the proof read by a scholar familiar with German and with history. These examples, unless otherwise indicated, are from the first volume: On p. 62 Johannes von Mueller's "Einleitung in die Geschichte der Eidgenossenschaft" is rendered "preface to the history of leagues and confederations." On p. 347 we have "the priest John" for "Prester John"; on p. 349 "Toscanellis Brief" is translated "pamphlet"; on p. 352 we meet with "Celi, Duke of Medina," instead of "the Duke of Medina-Celi." On p. 364 we are puzzled by a reference to the discoveries of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and find that the German reads, "die Entdeckungen im dritten und vierten Jahrzehnt des 16 Jahrhunderts." Again, on p. 391 one stumbles over the sentence, "It was impossible to form any conception of the revenues and progress of the colonies without having sufficient working material in the shape of native labor"; but a glance at the original lifts the veil; "an Einnahmen oder Erträge aus den Kolonien war ohne ein zulängliches Material an eingebornen Arbeitern nicht zu denken." On p. 375 Haebler says Cortez seized Tescuco so as to attack Tenochtitlan, and adds, "Das er auch hier, nach Vertreibung des aztekischen Statthalters, hilfsbereite Bundesgenossen fand, war wieder eine klug in Berechnung gezogene Folge der politischen Verhältnisse von Anahuak"; in the English this becomes, "In consequence of the political situation which had been wisely computed by Anahuak, Cortez," etc. The confusion is even more striking when we are told in regard to the Spanish missionaries in America, "The mysticism of the Renaissance united with the enthusiasm for the natural conditions of human society which had arisen from Romanticism in casting reproach upon the Spanish missionaries that they with blind fanaticism had annihilated the last remnants of sacred antiquity," etc. The German is clear enough, but it naturally has to be understood before it can be translated. It begins, "Der unverständige Doctrinarismus der Aufklärungszeit im Bunde mit der aus der Romantik hervorgegangenen Schwärmerei," etc. These words may be rendered, "The unintelligent

dogmatism of the eighteenth-century rationalists joined with the enthusiasm of the Romanticists for the state of nature," etc. *Die Aufklärung* and *die Aufklärungszeit* in the other volumes are usually rendered "enlightenment," "age of enlightenment." It seems to me, however, that in general historical narrative the proper equivalents are "rationalism" and "eighteenth-century rationalism." In several passages in this first volume the sense is obscured by rendering *wirtschaftlich* by "agricultural" instead of "economic." Two more errors may be mentioned, which must be charged up against the proof-reader. The reviser of the last chapter is Karl Weule in the German and Charles Weale in the English; and the portrait of Toscanelli is labeled Colombo, and that of Columbus is labeled Toscanelli.

EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE.

A General History of Commerce. By WILLIAM CLARENCE WEBSTER, Ph.D. (Boston and London: Ginn and Company. 1903. Pp. ix, 526.)

It is the intention of the author and publishers that this book shall serve a three-fold purpose: that it shall be used (1) as a text-book in secondary schools that offer regular courses in economic history; (2) as a text-book in lower classes of colleges; and (3) as a companion book to the study of general history, or of the history of particular nations, in all schools. On the whole, because of its scope and method of treatment, it is probably best adapted for the third of these purposes. For the first purpose it ought to be preceded, in order to secure satisfactory results, by a thorough course in general history; for the second purpose it is hardly advanced and detailed enough, and for both purposes its point of view gives rise to serious objections to its use in courses other than the courses in history proper. A few characterizations will bring out more clearly this nature of the work.

It is a history of civilization in which is taken the commercial point of view of the history of the rise and fall of nations. It is really a story of national life. In his endeavor to "get clear-cut and accurate pictures of the commercial growth and decay of separate nations," and not to fail "to grasp the dramatic element which the subject presents," the author has too much emphasized the fact that commerce "prosperes in peace and is destroyed by war," and has not satisfactorily fulfilled his promise of presenting "an understanding of industrial, racial, and climatic" conditions which determine the course of industrial and commercial life. This makes the work more valuable for students who desire, for instance, suggestions as to the commercial aspects of the war between Philip II. and the Netherlands, or of the struggle for supremacy between England and France, than for students who are studying commerce and industry for the sake of the principles involved.

As the title indicates, it is a general history. In the space of 514 pages the author reviews the commercial history of nations from the earliest time to the present. It is necessarily, therefore, a compact statement

of facts and conclusions. The result is that the work is hardly detailed enough for a college course, although of suggestive value to students at that stage. For students in secondary schools, on the other hand, the author has succeeded in presenting so much, in so compact a form and with so many historical allusions, that to make its use profitable there should be a thorough preparation in general history.

In execution the author has been very successful. The parts are well balanced. A few generalizations are open to contradiction, a few more to question, but on the whole the work shows a good grasp of the historical movements in the various periods. In his analysis of the essential features of the industrial and commercial life of the last period the author is not so fortunate. The style is smooth and the ideas clearly presented. There is a good index and good bibliographical reference-lists. The eighteen maps are very helpful; ten more, in place of the illustrations of vessels of the various periods, would have helped the text so much the more.

Dr. Webster's work will be found to be a very suggestive companion book for students of political and of industrial history; and in those institutions in which the work is all commercial, in which there are no courses in general history, and in which something is needed to fill this place, this work is the best that has yet been published.

H. S. PERSON.

A History of Egypt. By E. A. W. BUDGE. (Oxford: University Press; New York: Henry Frowde. 1902. Eight volumes. Pp. xxiv, 222; xvi, 207; xvi, 219; xvi, 241; xvi, 219; xxxiv, 230; xvi, 251; xvi, 321.)

RESEARCH in the field of Egyptian history can hardly be said to have kept pace with the rapid progress made in the study of the language in the last twenty years. The career of the Nile valley peoples in its principal epochs and broad outlines may now be traced with a fair degree of clearness, but the whole subject abounds in unsettled problems which require to solve them only the collection of the existent materials, and bristles with innumerable questions demanding special investigation. The very bulk of the history under review would suggest that at least some of this work had been done in its preparation, but such is not the case. The author frequently attempts the solution of the more patent problems, but he is for the most part unconscious of their existence. Why his researches are not more successful will be apparent as we proceed.

The work covers the entire sweep of Egyptian history from the earliest times to the absorption of the country into the Roman Empire. The division into volumes is not well done: the twenty-sixth dynasty is needlessly cut in two at the end of Volume VI., and the Ptolemies suffer the same fate at the end of Volume VII. The method of treatment is a modification of the one introduced by Brugsch and Wiedemann in Germany and followed by Petrie in England. It consists of presenting the

documentary and monumental sources themselves, arrayed before the reader in motley succession, accompanied by some few interpretative remarks by the author. That this is not history but merely the materials for a history is of course evident. The obvious function of the historian, of sifting, classifying, arranging, and then basing a coherent and carefully digested treatment of each epoch upon these sources, plays no part in such a work. There is an attempt to avoid this difficulty in the present work by appending to each period that has been so treated a summary. If these summaries had been skilfully done and put together in a volume by themselves, the whole work would have been much improved. As it is, it suffers from repetition. As each volume is introduced by a preface summarizing its content, the repetition becomes intolerable, especially as repetitiousness is characteristic of the author. For example, he says, "In this coffin was found a mummy which was believed to be that of the queen, but when it was opened on June 27th, 1886, the inscriptions which were found upon the bandages, etc., showed that it was the mummy of king Painetchem" (III. 200, 201). Only six pages further on (not in the summary) he says, "The mummy which was inside the coffin of queen Aah-hetep was opened on June 27, 1886, and the inscriptions on the bandages proved that it was the mummy of Painetchem." Again in successive sentences: ". . . at Elephantine he built a small but most interesting temple in honor of Khnemu, the Nubian god of the first cataract. This building was comparatively small . . ." (IV. 110). A number of similar examples might be offered.

As to the character of the sources, in the form presented by the author, several facts should be noted. The classic sources are not cited in the best and the latest translations; indeed (to use the author's own words), "The extracts from the History of Herodotus, given in English, are taken from the quaint and charming old rendering of the first two books by 'B. R.,' which was published in 1584"!! Page after page of this "quaint and charming old rendering," with the old English spelling unchanged, and in critical passages bristling with errors that make it worthless, are then offered for the reader's delectation. The Egyptian sources are given in translations or in summaries and occasionally in the original. The most difficult and uncertain passages are rendered in the smoothest of modern English, without a hint of an interrogation point. The Egyptian sources are therefore far more untrustworthy than the classic. Of the philological side of the work we shall have occasion to speak further.

It is impossible within the necessary limits of a review to discuss the large and difficult question of the chronology. The author adopts with some modification the system of Brugsch, without seeming to know that Brugsch later accepted without reservation the astronomical results of Mahler — results which the author rejects after the most superficial examination, and results which make quite impossible his own system.

The vast period covered by the work, as well as the amount of material involved, make it quite impossible to survey the author's treatment of the

successive epochs with which he deals. All that we can do is to examine the character of his methods and results, and determine whether or not his work is trustworthy. We have already noted that the repetitions in the work indicate a tendency to forget entirely what he has already stated. But this tendency does not stop at repetition; it goes on to contradict calmly, in a manner that is simply amazing, what has already been dogmatically stated in previous pages. Permit me to offer a few examples:

1. In speaking of the stela between the fore legs of the Great Sphinx, the author says, "In the thirteenth line of the inscription, the cartouche of Khaf-Ra occurs, but the text is too mutilated to see in what exact connection" (II. 50). Later he states, "... the few legible words in line 14 tell us that the Sphinx was made by king Khaf-Ra" (IV. 86). The first statement is correct; the second, contradicting it, is pure fiction.

2. Referring to the wooden coffin found in the third pyramid of Gizeh, the author says: "So far back as 1883 . . . certain Egyptologists had declared the wooden coffin of Men-kau-Ra to be a 'restoration' of the XXVIth Dynasty, and not an original piece of work of the IVth Dynasty. . . . The statements put forth in support of the restoration theory are inconclusive and quite insufficient to set aside the opinion of the experienced archaeologists [Birch and Maspero] mentioned above" (II. 60-61). Now this alleged fourth-dynasty coffin is mummyiform and had a mummy's face and head. But later in arguing on the age of the coffins of the "Antef kings," the author says, "... no example of a coffin made in the shape of a mummy with a human face is known to belong to these early periods" (II. 182). As he is referring to the eleventh dynasty and earlier, the above mummyiform coffin, affirmed by him to belong to the fourth dynasty, is here by his own admission necessarily of later date than the eleventh dynasty.

3. In speaking of the last Montuhotep, a Theban Pharaoh of the eleventh dynasty, the author says, "... before his death his empire extended from the sea coast on the north to a point some considerable distance to the south of Aswan" (II. 202); but a few pages further on, in the first paragraph of the very next volume, he remarks of the Theban Amenemhet I. (who reigned two generations later), "... he was the first of the princes of Thebes who succeeded in making himself actually king of the Nile Valley from the Mediterranean Sea to Aswan" (III. 1).

4. The British Museum possesses a pair of magnificent sculptured lions placed in the Nubian temple at Soleb by Amenhotep III.; they were later carried southward to Gebel Barkal in Nubia by one of the Nubian kings. Of these lions the author says that they "are thought by some to have been taken there [to Gebel Barkal] from the north by the king who usurped them, but that seems unlikely" (IV. 112). Later, however, he states: "It is usually said that Amenhotep III. set up here just under the mountain called Gebel Barkal, a building . . . but there is no evidence that he did so, for the lions inscribed with his name . . .

which were found there were probably brought to that site from the temple at Soleb" (VI. 100).

5. The discussion of the remarkable reign of Amenhotep IV. calls out the following remark: "The mummy of Amenhotep IV. was found in the tomb of Amenhotep II. at Der al-Bahari" (IV. 129). A list of the royal mummies found in this tomb is later inserted, and it contains the name "Amenhotep IV." (IV. 175). In the face of all this we find in the next volume a page and a half devoted to a demonstration that M. Loret was wrong in asserting that among the royal mummies found by him in the tomb of Amenhotep II. was that of Amenhotep IV.; and the author adds that in January, 1900, he himself inspected the mummy alleged to be that of Amenhotep IV. and reached the conclusion that his colleagues were correct in asserting that it was not such, but that it belonged to Merneptah, supposed to be the Pharaoh of the Exodus. The two volumes containing these contradictory statements bear the year 1902 on the title-page as do all the volumes of the work.

Where unfamiliarity with what has already been said in the author's own work is so evident, acquaintance with what other men have said or with the evidence of the monuments is hardly to be expected. Of some of the most important monuments the work shows total ignorance. One of the important activities of Egypt's earliest period was her commerce with Punt (the Somali coast) by the Red Sea route. A very interesting inscription in a tomb at Assuan contains the autobiography of a nobleman named Pepinakht, who relates how he was sent to the Red Sea coast to rescue and bring back the body of an officer who, while building a ship there for a voyage to Punt, had been set upon and killed by the Beduin of the region. Not knowing of this inscription, nor of another at Assuan showing that at least two more voyages to Punt were made in the Old Kingdom, the author tortures the reference to the only expedition thither with which he is acquainted in this period into an overland route to Punt, for which there is not the slightest evidence (II. 120, 134). These four voyages took place in the fifth and sixth dynasties, in the middle of the third millennium before Christ, and are the earliest long voyages in the open sea known in human history; but our author knows of no voyage to Punt until the eleventh dynasty (II. 206), nor of any "sea-going boats" earlier than the same period (VI. 59). The family of nobles who carried on this commerce for the Pharaohs of the time resided at Assuan, on the island of Elephantine at the foot of the first cataract. In one of the neighboring cliffs their tomb chapels are hewn, and it is in these chapels that they have left the records of their adventurous voyages. They naturally also led the Pharaoh's caravans into the upper cataract region to trade among the Nubian tribes for ebony, ivory, gold, and panther-skins. The most famous of these border nobles was Hirkhuf, who penetrated to the pygmies of the interior and brought back one of them for the Pharaoh. After recounting this man's expeditions, the author says, "It is much to be hoped that other inscriptions of the kind may be forthcoming" (II. 120). Considering the fact that the

author has visited and written at length upon the Assuan tombs (PSBA X. 4-40) and even assisted in their excavation, it is remarkable that he should be unacquainted with the content of the inscriptions in the tomb of Sabni (of which he himself took squeezes on his visit there), which furnish us with another expedition like that of Hirkhuf. Had the author made use of his own squeezes, the desired "other inscriptions of the kind" might have been "forthcoming." In the Old Kingdom, for a knowledge of which our sources are so painfully scanty, we therefore find that, in the matter of foreign relations alone, three important inscriptions, two of them long ones, are unknown to the author. Again, in the foreign relations of the Middle Kingdom, the expedition of Useratesen I. against the Beduin is unmentioned and seems to be unknown. Likewise the treatment of the foreign relations of the New Kingdom suffers from similar unfamiliarity with the existing evidence. The queen "Thi," who, in the opinion of our author, was a foreign princess from Mitanni, and is so often mentioned on the interesting commemorative scarabs of Amenhotep III., is already mentioned on the great Bull-hunt scarab in the king's second year. But with this important monument the author is unacquainted, and he spends nearly two pages (IV. 98-100) on the question of the date of the queen's marriage, a question which would not have arisen if he had been acquainted with this scarab. The sources on the foreign connections of the New Kingdom contain monument after monument thus overlooked by the author. Thus the campaign of Amasis I. into Phoenicia is unknown to him (III. 188); he is unacquainted with the campaign of Thutmose II. on the Euphrates (III. 215); he has overlooked the advance of Thutmose III. to Lebanon on his first campaign after the fall of Megiddo (IV. 36, 37). Such are some of the more important oversights bearing on foreign relations alone. But the worst sin of this character in the work is in the treatment of the eleventh dynasty. A group of Pharaohs named Intef or Antef, usually assigned to this dynasty, have been shown by Steindorff to belong, *with some exceptions*, to the seventeenth dynasty, some four hundred years later. Our author, using Steindorff's results (without acknowledgment, by the way), is so captivated with the idea of the later date for these kings that he overlooks the exceptions, and bundles the whole group unceremoniously into the seventeenth dynasty. Yet the tombstone of a man who lived early in the twelfth dynasty records the fact that he held an office to which his great-grandfather before him had been appointed by one of the Antefs, called Uah-ankh. This "Uah-ankh," therefore, must of course have lived before the twelfth dynasty; but not knowing of this tombstone, which is in the museum of Leyden (V. 3; Piehl Insc. III. XXI.-XXII.), our author carries Antef-"Uah-ankh" also over to the seventeenth dynasty!

The above omissions concern only original documents; it would be useless to cite examples of unfamiliarity with the researches of the last twenty years. Even the time-honored "poet laureate of the day," Pentaur, who was buried with honors by Erman twenty years ago, still

figures in a musty paragraph of this work (VI. 52). Where a modern work is cited and apparently used by the author, a closer examination reveals that his acquaintance with it does not extend beyond the title. Thus he refers to Schaefer's new edition of the great Nastesen Stela in Berlin, but in his use of the monument he employs the mention of *Don-gola* (VIII. 157), formerly supposed (by Maspero) to be found upon it, not knowing that the cleaning of the stone and the new collation by Schaefer have shown that no such word exists in the text. But the vast majority of the results of recent research, except those gained by excavation, have no place in the work whatever.

Turning from the material which the author has overlooked to that which he has employed, the misunderstandings and errors are numerous, far exceeding the slips of which every historian must now and again be guilty. We are told that the obelisk of Hatshepsut at Thebes weighs 3,650 tons (IV. 18), which is about ten times its actual weight; and the fact that such numbers are found in the old guide-books inclines one to think that it is not a misprint here. It is stated that the Lateran obelisk gives the length of time between the reigns of Thutmose III. and Thutmose IV. as 35 years (IV. 60), whereas it only states that it had been *lying on the ground* as left by Thutmose III. for 35 years until it was erected by Thutmose IV. We find Amenhotep III. referred to as the son of Amenhotep II. (IV. 161), though he was in reality his grandson; we see Thutmose IV. making an expedition to Phœnicia on the basis of an inscription of the reign of his grandfather, Thutmose III. (IV. 79); while Ramses III. is made to fight a great naval battle on the coast of Palestine, although the inscriptions clearly state that it took place in Phœnicia (V. 152). This list might be continued indefinitely; and to these errors of the author's own making might be added a long list of those which he has taken over from the work of other men, some of which clearly earmark the secondary sources which he has used, like the list of dead and captured in Ramses III.'s second Libyan war (V. 157), which contains a mistake in the numbers to be found only in Chabas's translation (and in Maspero's *Histoire*, from the same source).

From what has been said it will be evident that this work has been put together with a haste which has made careful work and safe results an impossibility. Almost every page bears evidence of a looseness that is fatal to the results. The great copper statue of King Pepi appears at first as of copper, but regularly after that as of bronze; of the ships of Queen Hatshepsut on their return up the Red Sea from the Somali coast, the author says, "In due course the ships arrived at Thebes . . ." (IV. 10). What ships? There was no water connection between the Nile and the Red Sea at this time. When such looseness is found in the treatment of purely material things, the reader may imagine what happens when the author treats abstract questions demanding something of historic sympathy and an appreciation of historical and race psychology. Hence we find the Nubian conqueror Piankhi, when he was unable to catch a certain clever Delta prince and force him to surrender,

innocently eulogized in this delicious fashion: "... it was a generous act on the part of the Nubian conqueror to spare him such a terrible humiliation in the sight of his former allies . . ." (IV. 114).

The question of transliteration, being exclusively philological, cannot be treated in this REVIEW, but the general observation should certainly be made that the old misreadings scattered through this work are very numerous, besides many of the author's own making, like the absurd miswriting of the name of Amenhotep IV. both in hieroglyphic and transliteration (IV. 118). But the reader can best judge of these if he notes that the Tanite king, known to the Greeks as Smendes, appears in this work as "Nes-ba-Tetet," "Nes-ba-neb-Tet," "Ba-neb-Tet," and "Nes-ba-Tet" (VI. 1, 4, 7); and the Egyptian name of Cambyses is now "Ra-mesuth" and again "Mesthu-Ra" (VII. 42, 45); although there is but one correct form for each of these two names.

The English of the work, like the method employed, is loose. I cannot forbear quoting a remarkable passage regarding the inscription set up at the southern boundary of Egypt by Userthesen III.: "It prohibited every negro from passing that spot, whether by sailing down the river or marching along its banks, as well as the passage of all oxen and sheep and goats and asses, except such as were engaged in the traffic in cattle, and such as had need to come to Egypt for the purposes of barter and of business generally" (III. 36-37).

The work is very fully illustrated, presenting many unpublished monuments, some of them of great importance. For the publication of this material every student of Egyptian civilization will be grateful to the author. The monuments of the earliest dynastic as well as of the predynastic period from the rich collections of the British Museum, thus made accessible to the public, are especially valuable. The statue of Apet (II. 5), dated by the author in the archaic period, is a forgery and was made for one of the mudirs of Upper Egypt.

While severe strictures upon the author's method have been necessary, there are respects in which the work will prove very useful. The account of the successive excavations which have brought us our knowledge of the earliest dynasties; the attempt to furnish a complete list of all known royal names; the insertion of Moslem sources on the former state of the monuments; and the full citation of classic sources, where a proper translation has been employed, all these will be very convenient for ready reference. It is much to be regretted that the service rendered by the author in these particulars should be obscured by the defects to which so much attention has so unavoidably been given above. Finally it should be added that the typography of the volumes is good and that misprints are rare.

The House of Seleucus. By EDWYN ROBERT BEVAN, M.A. (London: Edward Arnold; New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1902. Two vols. Pp. xii, 330; viii, 333.)

OF making many Greek histories — *in usum scholarum* — there is no end. The beaten track is become a very boulevard from the Plain of Troy

to the field of Chæronea ; and then — the jungle. Now and then we have the story of greater Greece from the hand of a master like Grote ; but the historian of Athenian democracy had no heart for the plunge from the city-state to the world-empire. He had no use for "that non-Hellenic conqueror," "who, though not a Greek, had become the master of all Greeks" ; and it is but coldly and under protest that he follows him and his spurious Hellenism into Asia and drops anchor for good and all in "that gulf of Grecian nullity which marks the succeeding century." Among English historians of Greece only Thirlwall, whom nobody now reads, has taken the larger and juster view of his subject ; and, if the modern student is coming to see that it was not all over with Greece when Demosthenes ended his own life at Calauria, it is mainly due not to the formal histories, but to Mahaffy's suggestive and discursive studies. While these do not constitute, they may at least inspire a definitive history of Hellenism — not in the narrow sense nor within the narrow limits of Droysen, but a fresh and exhaustive survey of the whole wide field of Grote, Droysen, Mommsen, and Finlay.

In our own time archaeology has been writing new and brilliant chapters for the very opening of such a history — at Troy and Mycenæ and Knossos ; and now the explorer is pushing into the more forbidding jungles of the east. With his second volume Niese has brought his *Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten* down to the death of Antiochus III. (187 B. C.), and Kaerst's first volume (*Geschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters*) covers the life of Alexander ; while Adolf Holm's fourth volume undertakes "to describe for the first time the whole course of Greek life and thought in Europe and beyond the Mediterranean, from the death of Alexander down to the battle of Actium." And now comes Mr. Bevan on a line of his own — that of segregating the youngest of the Diadochi and following the fortunes of his house to the finish. In his own words, he "sets out to illuminate . . . the work accomplished by the dynasty of Seleucus in its stormy transit of the world's stage two thousand years ago." It is no fault of the illuminator if the light sometimes fails and oftentimes barely serves to make the darkness visible ; and he has certainly economized the last ray that could be wrung from the sources within reach. To a mere annalist the case would be desperate, but that is not Mr. Bevan's quality ; to him, as to us, the house of Seleucus is chiefly important not in its external fortunes, but because it was under its ægis that Hellenism struck roots in all lands from the Mediterranean to the Pamir.

It is indeed an illuminating as well as a noble chapter on "Hellenism in the East" with which our author begins his work. Hellenism was the product of the Greek city-state, whose achievement it was to bring freedom and civilization into union ; it implied a certain type of character — that of the free man dominated by duty to the state — and it implied a certain cast of ideas, for this duty-bound freeman lived in an atmosphere of debate and habitually referred all things to the standard of reason and reality. Yet a great part of Hellenism, once developed,—

the body of ideas, of literary and artistic tastes — was communicable to men who had not themselves lived under those conditions. Before the end of the fourth century it had leavened Macedonia and followed Alexander's flag to the ends of the earth; and long after the conqueror's death the ruling powers from the Balkans to the Indus continued to be Greek in speech and mind. Then Rome, the real successor of Alexander, having itself taken all the mental and artistic culture it possesses from the Greeks, steps in to maintain the supremacy of Greek civilization in the east. Hellenism, however, had still to pay the price. The law of ancient history was inexorable: a large state must be a monarchic state. Rome in becoming a world-power became a monarchy. Thus, thanks to despotic kings — first Macedonian, and then Roman — Hellenism is carried far beyond its original borders: the vessel is broken and the long-secreted elixir is poured out for the nations. And the old heaven is still working. "What we call the Western spirit in our own day is really Hellenism reincarnate. . . . All through the chaos the seeds of the old culture were carefully nursed. . . . Men at the Renaissance took up the thoughts of the Greeks again where they had dropped them." "The civilization which perished from India with the extinction of the Greek kings has come back again in the person of the British official." But "Hellenism has as yet had very little time to show — what it can do" — say, in Manchuria!

We have tried to summarize this chapter because it gives the author's key-note; and, for a translator of *Æschylus*, his point of view is sufficiently modern. The second chapter, on the "Physical Environment," in a way recalls Ernst Curtius, as does the painstaking topography of the whole work; yet we miss Curtius's vivid autopsy. Following these general chapters, the author proceeds to narrate "the series of events that led up to the virtual conquest of the whole heritage of Alexander by Seleucus" (Chaps. III.–VI.); next he traces the history of his successors down to the assassination of Seleucus III., in so far as that history is concerned with Asia Minor (Chaps. VII.–X.); and then takes each of the other provinces — Syria, Babylonia, Iran, India — in turn to see what can be gleaned of its life under these Hellenistic kings (Chaps. XI.–XIV.). The plan is hardly an ideal one, though we cannot quarrel with Mr. Bevan for not constructing an orderly history out of the scraps at his command; but one may wonder that, having picked up the dropped stitches, he does not seize the moment of Seleucus's fate — leaving his empire apparently in the throes of dissolution — to bring his first volume to a close, instead of running on a chapter on the "First Years of Antiochus III."

Thus the second volume would gain a completeness and unity impossible in the first. There is the long reign of Antiochus the Great — twenty years of incessant fighting that wins back well-nigh all that his father and grandfather had lost, until Rome takes a hand, and a decade later the hundred years' struggle of the house of Seleucus for Asia Minor ends with the practical annihilation of the king's army by Scipio at

Magnesia (190 B. C.) ; and the empire, which had almost been the empire of Alexander, shrinks to a kingdom of Syria (Chaps. XV.—XXI.). Henceforth, the plot has but a single thread, and that is cut short when Pompey appears as conqueror in Syria to settle its affairs in the name of Rome, and the kingdom of the house of Seleucus is come to an utter end (64 B. C.). But not the house ; the kings of Commagene boasted its blood, and one of them — without a throne but still calling himself king, though he had been a Roman consul and was then an Athenian citizen, enrolled in the deme of Besa — set up at Athens as late as 115 A. D. the well-known monument of Philopappos.

Reckoning from "the year of the Greeks" (312 B. C.) — when young Seleucus, whom we have seen slipping out of Babylon four years earlier and riding for his life with fifty horsemen to Egypt, routs Demetrius at Gaza and reestablishes himself as master in the house of Nebuchadnezzar — until Philip II., and with him the house of Seleucus, finally disappears (56 B. C.), the era of the Seleucids comprises more than a quarter-millennium, and the fortunes of the house touch every height and every depth. Here is room and verge for the historian ; and, withal, temptation to let fancy range where fact is not forthcoming. But Mr. Bevan is no romancer : he frankly tells us when the light goes out, and yet from point to point he holds fast his clue. Thus to illustrate at once his frankness and his force :

For us a great cloud comes down upon the contest. History has mainly forgotten it. We can only see dim glints of armies that sweep over Western Asia, and are conscious of an imbroglio of involved wars. But we can understand the stupendous nature of that task which the house of Seleucus set itself to do — to hold together under one scepter against all the forces which battered it, forces stronger than any by which the Achæmenian Empire had ever been assailed till the coming of Alexander, against all the elements of disruption which sapped it within, the huge fabric built up by Seleucus Nicator. It was a labour of Sisyphus. The Empire, a magnificent *tour de force*, had no natural vitality. Its history from the moment it misses the founder's hand is one of decline. It was a "sick man" from its birth. Its construction occupied the few glorious years of Seleucus Nicator, its dissolution the succeeding two and a quarter centuries. Partially restored again and again, it lapses almost immediately into new ruin. The restorations become less and less complete. But it does a great work in propagating and defending Hellenism in the East till the advent of Rome (I. 75ff.).

While candor and sobriety are the chief notes, and the resultant sketchiness and inequality of treatment make but dry reading, these pages are brightened by many a sunburst — as when our author tells over again Polybius's story of the betrayal of Achæus (which General Funston's biographer should not fail to read) ; or Demetrius's escape from Rome, after the same first-hand authority ; or Antiochus's benevolent assimilation of the Jews — "the little people" who had hitherto "dwelt separate in their hill country and, while wars rolled past them and king-

doms clashed and changed, nursed the sacred fire and meditated on the Law of the Lord."

In the present state of knowledge, with literary sources mainly at second-hand and scrappy, while over most of the territory in question where the monumental sources lie buried the archæologist has not yet broken ground, no definitive history can be written; but Mr. Bevan has done good work in this fore-study of what must ultimately take its place as a notable chapter in the great history of Hellenism. Should the book ever come to a second edition, which is hardly probable, it would be the better for two or three "helps": first, a chronological table like that prefixed to Mahaffy's *Greek Life and Thought*; second, side-notes such as make Grote's *History* and many subsequent works doubly useful and usable; and third, some such digest and critique of authorities as Holm appends to his chapters. The three maps are fair and the plates excellent, presenting a fine series of Seleucid portrait-heads on forty-six coin types.

J. IRVING MANATT.

Augustus: The Life and Times of the Founder of the Roman Empire.

By E. S. SHUCKBURGH. (London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1903. Pp. x, 318.)

Augustus Caesar and the Organisation of the Empire of Rome. By JOHN B. FIRTH. [Heroes of the Nations.] (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1903. Pp. xvi, 371.)

"AUGUSTUS," says Shuckburgh, "has been much less attractive to biographers than Julius; perhaps because the soldier is more interesting than the statesman; perhaps because the note of genius conspicuous in the Uncle was wanting in the Nephew." Firth, after remarking that to his knowledge no biography of Augustus had yet appeared in English, suggests that "the reason of this apparent neglect may be found in the circumstance that his character is one of the most puzzling in antiquity. The Emperor Julian compared him to a chameleon; Augustus himself signed his State papers with a ring bearing the device of a Sphinx. Both the man and his work remain 'a contradiction still'; theory and practice in his case persistently refuse to be reconciled; one can hardly feel quite sure at any given point in Augustus's life that one knows exactly what he had in mind." Perhaps a still better reason is that the biographer finds extremely little to add to the historian. Firth and Shuckburgh enter a field which has already been well cultivated; historians like Merivale, Schiller, Herzog, and Duruy, whose works include the reign of Augustus, have dealt creditably with the subject, and each in his own way has solved, or attempted to solve, the sphinx-riddle. In approaching these two recent biographies, therefore, we may look for little that is new; but we shall not be disappointed in expecting to find the old material put into a fresher and more convenient form.

The compass of the two works is nearly the same, Shuckburgh treating the subject with somewhat greater detail. After devoting a few pages

to the childhood and youth of Augustus, both writers proceed to narrate his public career — in other words, to write the history of Rome during his lifetime. This treatment includes the condition of Rome and the Empire at the death of Julius Cæsar, the political struggles and the civil wars from 43 to 31 B. C., the organization of the imperial government, the provinces, the chief events of the reign of Augustus, his patronage of literature and religion, his family affairs, and his character. As little is known of his motives and feelings, the treatment must be to a great extent impersonal. Lacking therefore the essential feature of biography, a life of Augustus can hardly be more than a chapter from Roman history. For this condition of their subject, however, Firth and Shuckburgh are in no way responsible.

Characteristic of the present trend of opinion is the attitude of these two authors toward the revolution from Republic to Empire. Shuckburgh and Firth are in thorough sympathy with Julius Cæsar and his work ; they have no love for the oligarchs, whose mismanagement made the revolution necessary. Though Cicero naturally suffers along with the oligarchs, he is a far better and abler man than he appears to be in Mommsen's history ; he is " the great man " (Shuckburgh), " the patriot statesman — and with all his faults no Roman better deserved that honourable name " (Firth). Young Octavius falls heir to the sympathy for Julius felt by the biographers. They fully appreciate his ability and especially his inborn talent for intrigue ; and they follow with admiration his early career, without attempting to make black white, or to deny or excuse his cruelty in the proscriptions of 43 B. C.

One of the most interesting and most extensively discussed subjects connected with Augustus is the character of his government. Whereas earlier writers had uniformly described the government of Augustus as " a monarchy disguised in republican forms," Mommsen declared it to have been a dyarchy — a division of authority between the Senate and the prince —, and his view is now accepted by most scholars, who apply it with more or less consistency to the treatment of the early Empire. But Shuckburgh, after mentioning this view, insists that Augustus was really " a monarch, whose will was only limited by those forces of circumstance and sentiment to which the most autocratic of sovereigns have at times been forced to bow." Firth, following the present trend of thought, says of Augustus :

His great aim was to graft the Principate upon the Republic. He did not wish to uproot the old tree and plant a new one ; his desire was to furnish the old tree with a new branch, which should be the most vital of all its limbs. In the constitution were many magistracies ; he added yet another. If it was one of extraordinary scope and power, the justification was that the times required it.

Though the magisterial powers of the prince were vast, the government was not for that reason a monarchy pure and simple. It was still a republic in the theory expressed by Augustus and accepted by the Senate ; but in fact the term dyarchy aptly applies to it because of (1)

the division of the Roman world into Italy and the Empire, each with peculiar administrative principles and machinery; (2) the division of the Empire into senatorial provinces and imperial provinces; (3) the two treasuries; (4) the two sets of officials. But Firth supposes that the dyarchy fell at the accession of Tiberius, if not before, whereas writers generally continue it to Domitian or even to Aurelian. For the right understanding of this subject it is advantageous to separate the arbitrary acts of the emperors from the legitimate working of the constitution. This discrimination is necessary, especially as the period of the early Empire was one in which usurpation and tyranny were easy.

The final chapter of each book is devoted to the great enigma — the character and aims of Augustus. Firth minutely analyzes the first emperor's character; Shuckburgh, avoiding detail, finds space for a brief estimate of the intimate friends of Augustus. Firth, more ready than Shuckburgh to accept the gossip of Suetonius, discovers in the emperor a combination of loose morality and asceticism. Both authors, while bearing in mind the hypocrisy of his position, rightly appreciate the substantial nature of his achievements. Firth says in conclusion:

He knitted together the Roman world, east and west, into one great organisation of which the emperor stood as the supreme head. He set his legions upon the distant frontiers and their swords formed a wall of steel, within which commerce and peace might flourish. . . . Augustus started the Roman world on a new career. He made it realise its unity for the first time. That was his life-work, and its consequences remain to this day.

On the whole, Shuckburgh treats the subject more objectively, and is perhaps a little more careful in his statement of facts, though Firth's book will doubtless prove more interesting to the general reader. Both writers, however, are attractive as well as scholarly, and their works will certainly be helpful to all who are interested in Augustus and his age.

GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD.

An Introduction to the History of Western Europe. By JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON, Professor of History in Columbia University. (Boston: Ginn and Company. 1903. Pp. x, 714.)

IN the opinion of the writer this is the best manual of general European history which has yet appeared in English. And the reason for Professor Robinson's comparative success in the impossible task of compressing into seven hundred readable pages a clear account of the chief events and movements of European history from the barbarian invasions of the fifth century to the formation of the kingdom of Italy and the German Empire appears to be the consistent application to his task of two principles — omission and emphasis. Mr. Robinson has proved the sincerity of the opinion expressed in his preface, that most elementary manuals of history mention too many men and too many facts, and has avoided producing a book which by expecting the student to learn too much runs the danger of teaching him nothing. The author's omissions

are a relief to the teacher. He has secured his emphasis upon the chief events and personages by expansion, which is the surest method. An extremely attentive student will remember that a thing is important if he is told that it is; a very acute student, diligent or lazy, will find out the important things in a book or a lecture for himself; but the average student is not apt to be extremely attentive or very acute, and instinctively judges the relative importance of different parts of any extended course of instruction by the time or space given to them. It is necessary of course to train students away from the habit of mental relaxation which produces this instinctive judgment, but Mr. Robinson is wise to take full account of the general attitude of the average mind and to expand his narrative when he comes to movements of such capital importance as the schisms of the sixteenth century and the French Revolution.

The insistence upon personality by careful and comparatively full accounts of the character and work of the chief actors in the story of western Europe is also an advantage of this manual. In giving historical instruction it is wise to emphasize great men, because they make the ages in which they live and also because they are made by them. It is doubly wise to do this in elementary instruction, because to personify causes and effects in a character which is both result and agent is often the easiest way to make a small amount of information about them understandable and memorable to the average mind.

The most marked advantage which this book has over its predecessors is that it gives a proper amount of space to the history of the Church. The writer makes clear that the life of the men of the middle ages was largely dominated by the nature of their religion and complicated by the organization of the Church to which they all belonged. He appreciates the difficulty which American students have in understanding a religion organized in a form which gave to churchmen many of the functions we think of as belonging to the state. No other text-book, so far as the writer knows, makes this side of the life of the middle ages so clear. It seems, however, that Professor Robinson has failed to make sufficiently plain the corruption of the Church, not only in its members, but in its head previous to the reforms of the eleventh century. Although he is quite right in suggesting that it is possible to emphasize too much its corruption by failing to insist upon the usefulness which kept it alive even in the ages of debasement. It would appear also that some mention should be made of the monastic reforms which preceded the reform of the papacy, and of the great influence of monks in restoring the ideal of the vicar of Christ. It would also have been well to define the right of sanctuary and its relation to the civil law. Mention of the ascetic ideal and its relation to monasticism should not have been omitted. The relations of the Church and the Empire, as the main thread of the narrative, would more naturally precede the accounts of the development of the French and English monarchies and serve as a sort of chronological scale against which the student could easily make cross-sections, so as to synchronize in his mind the events of the different lines followed in dif-

ferent chapters. In general the writer would suggest a little stronger emphasis on chronology. Parallel tables of kings, emperors, and popes, with the important names used in the book printed in larger type, might be useful. And a simple continuous list of dates of the events and personages mentioned, like the list of dates in Freeman's little handbook of European history, would be an advantage. The backbone of a beginner's knowledge of history is chronology in the sense of the order of succession; and the dates a student learns and forgets do him a large amount of good. Forgotten information is one element of culture.

The chief defect of the book is an exaggeration of one of its merits. The instructor who handles it must be on his guard against the danger of leaving a vague impression on the pupil's mind. Conditions during past ages—that is what we need to know of course; but the beginner before he can understand conditions must first know what has happened and when it happened. Mr. Robinson could have improved his book by trying somewhat more to show conditions by relating events. The dramatic instinct with all its danger of perverting truth is a thing to be used in the teaching of history.

The English of the book is commendable, though there are evidences of haste in an occasional clumsy arrangement of dependent clauses, sometimes amounting to squinting construction. There are a few instances of vagueness, such as, "The gradual bettering of conditions was due chiefly to general progress," etc.—which might mean almost anything. And there is an occasional expletive use of such adjectives as fair, brave, doughty, wonderful. The author has a way of mentioning by anticipation persons and things not yet explained, which would be confusing to some students and is no real gain. And it might be suggested that the book would be stronger if the author omitted most of the general paragraphs which foretell what he is going to say. The space thus gained could be used for some things that would strengthen the narrative. For example, the Hohenstaufens are brought very abruptly upon the scene in the person of Barbarossa. It might be well to suggest briefly where they came from. The history of Sicily is given in two foot-notes. The only mention of the Swiss confederacy is in a page of retrospect at the beginning of the account of Zwingli's schism. Whether the author thinks that those particular things ought to go in or not, certainly there are historical facts more important than some of his general paragraphs, which are repeated in the narrative in more impressive form. The scale of the narrative is one of the strong points of the book. But occasionally the author is not quite up to his own high standard in maintaining it. For example, the account of the German schism is in places expanded in a way which in so very condensed an account amounts to repetition, *e. g.* page 399 compared with page 409. And, on the other hand, the entire settlement of the *modus vivendi* in Germany and how it came about is condensed into a page. It might also be said of the admirable account of the French Revolution, that in one or two places the author gives too many details for the scale of his narrative. But all these are comparatively slight defects in a strong piece of work.

The illustrations are not entirely successful. The cathedral doors on page 342 are too small to show what they were intended to show. One or two compartments from each, enlarged, would show it better. And many of the portraits are so poor that it would be far better to omit them.

PAUL VAN DYKE.

The Arab Conquest of Egypt and the last Thirty Years of the Roman Dominion. BY ALFRED J. BUTLER. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Henry Frowde. 1902. Pp. xxxvii, 563.)

THERE are few periods in Mohammedan history so obscure as the years during which the conquest of Egypt took place. This is the more surprising in view of the completeness in detail of what has been handed down to us concerning the life of the founder of the new faith and the early years of its upbuilding. Even where Mohammedan annalists disagree and contradict each other, a little acumen and some historical discernment enable us to unravel the skein. The one great exception is Egypt. Here the primal facts are disputed and the leading dates uncertain. This may be due to the fact that very few of the classical and Arabic authorities who wrote on Egypt or who mentioned events occurring there really knew much about the country itself; the earliest Arabic writers lived a hundred years after the conquest; and the most learned of them, such as al-Makrizi, al-Suyuti, and Ibn Dukmak (all of the fifteenth century) are more topographers than historians; and the sources from which they drew were already in their day much troubled. The lacuna might have been filled by the works of Coptic writers; but only a small part of this literature has come down to us. The publication by Zotenberg in 1879 of the chronicle of the Coptic Bishop John of Nikiu, a good and reliable account of one who was born just a little too late to be an eye-witness of the conquest itself, is the foundation-stone upon which every reconstruction of this history must be built. Unfortunately it has come down to us incomplete and muddled and only in an Ethiopic version. Mr. Butler laments "the slightness of his acquaintance with Arabic," a circumstance which might have worked havoc with one who has had to deal so much with Arabic authorities, did not translations abound as well as helpful translators. And withal, Mr. Butler has occasionally slipped. The great historical work of Tabari he knows only from Zotenberg's French translation of the Persian rendering; otherwise he would not say (p. 326) that the treaty of Amr with Alexandria is only known from the Tabari quotation in Ibn Khaldun. Even one who runs may read it in the Leyden edition, Part I., p. 2588. Nor would he say (p. 66) that according to Tabari the Persian king Chosroes "issued an edict allowing the Christians in his dominions to restore their churches and to make converts of the Magians if they could." The text reads, "to restore their churches and permitted any one to go over to their church who wanted to do so, *except the Magians*"; which is much more intelligible as, according to Zoroastrian teaching, apostacy was punished by death (Nöldeke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber*, 287). The date

of Mohammed's letters to the various rulers is not 627 but 629, as is seen from the succinct account of Ibn S'ad, published and translated by Wellhausen in his *Skizzen*, IV. 97. That the future conqueror of Egypt, Amr ibn al-As, was sent by Mohammed with a letter to Oman, is mentioned not only by Ibn Ishak (Butler, p. 140, note 1) but also by Ibn S'ad; though not in the year 6 but in the year 10 (Wellhausen, IV. 102; VI. 25). On the whole, the latest German authorities who have written on Arabic history, such as August Müller, Nöldeke, and Wellhausen, are not cited by Butler. Certainly they do not, nor does Lane-Poole, deserve to be included in the sweeping condemnation of past historians in which Mr. Butler indulges. The work before us would not have turned out so voluminous, had not the author undertaken in many places to kill flies already dead.

But these are petty criticisms on the whole, and must not blind us from a full appreciation of the splendid piece of work which Mr. Butler has done; even though many of the arguments for his theses cannot be accepted without much reserve. He has gone into a most detailed examination of even the most minute points, and has certainly said all that can be said to-day upon the subject. His work is especially valuable as it presents a logical and connected history of all the events that led up to the conquest as well as of the conquest itself. It has usually been held that before the actual invasion of Egypt the country was laid under tribute to the Arabs by Cyrus for three or more years; that the refusal of the tribute by Manuel occasioned the invasion; that Mukaukas, who was a Copt, sided with the Arabs and rendered them every assistance; and that Alexandria after a long siege was captured by storm. It has been long known that the revolt of Manuel occurred several years later (645) and preceded the second capture of Alexandria. Butler's main point is to prove who this Mukaukas was and what rôle the Copts played during all this period. The personality of the man who played so large a part in the defense, or rather the betrayal, of Roman Egypt has always been the subject of the extremest doubt; even Wellhausen, in his latest works, is uncertain. Butler's identification of him with Cyrus, the Chalcedonian patriarch and viceroy of Heracleus, the oppressor of the Copts for ten long years, will probably command the assent of all serious students. That Egypt surrendered without a blow is a myth that has long since been dispelled; but the picture of the stubborn resistance which it offered is brought out effectually and learnedly by Butler. Whether the Copts remained entirely as indifferent to the coming of the Arabs as our author makes out is however open to some doubt. Mr. Butler seems to hold a brief for the Copts. And no doubt they have in the past been much maligned; but it is going too far to say that they remained entirely passive at both the Persian (616) and the Arab invasion. John of Nikiu, upon whose statements this idea rests, concedes that the Copts did aid the Mohammedans, though he says that this was only when the enemy had taken possession of the Fayum (p. 211). They had been forced within the pale of the established church (p. 252); and they

openly sided with the Arabs when Alexandria revolted (p. 471), even making a regular agreement with them until Alexandria was recaptured (p. 480). This does not look like entire passiveness; and we can well understand how they looked for some relief in the coming of the Arabs, preferring men of a strange faith to their own who had treated them so harshly. There is, however, no evidence that in the beginning they took up arms against the former overlords.

One of the most interesting of Butler's chapters (XXV.) deals with the library of Alexandria. No scholar to-day seriously believes that the Arabs would have been guilty of such a sacrilegious burning of books; but it is well to have the baselessness of the historical evidence for this sacrilege placed so clearly before us; its first circumstantial mention being in Abu al-Faraj, a Christian author of the late thirteenth century. Abu al-Faraj did not invent it; he invented nothing. Some such report must have been current, as it is found also in Abd al-Latif (1200), Abu al-Fida (1273-1331), and al-Makrizi (1365-1441); but for five centuries after its supposed occurrence no mention is made of it by either Christian or Mohammedan writers.

The special student of Mohammedan history will, however, hardly agree with Butler's relative estimates of the character of the Calif Omar and the conqueror of Egypt, Amr. The calif was anything but greedy (p. 459), as Butler, relying upon a sentence in al-Baladhuri, says. He was of a rugged and almost superhuman simplicity, as may be seen in the many traditions about him gathered by Tabari, or in the excellent sketch of his life quite recently published by Sachau ("Über den zweiten Chalifen Omar," in *J. B. der K. Preuss. Acad.*, 1902, xv.). His one and only thought was the state exchequer; and his somewhat harsh treatment of Amr was due to the fact that the latter was too strong a helpmate and too probably an opponent (Wellhausen, *Das arabische Reich*, p. 30). The later history of the califate shows how well-founded was this fear of successful generals in distant countries.

RICHARD GOTTHEIL.

Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence, and Constitutional Theory. By DUNCAN B. MACDONALD, M.A., B.D. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1903. Pp. xii, 386.)

PROFESSOR MACDONALD calls attention in the modest preface of this little volume to the lack of any text-book upon the subject of Muslim law and to the difficulties in the way of a student attempting to supply the need. No one with the slightest acquaintance with Arab history and institutions will fail to sympathize in his description of the obstacles to an effort to render this complicated subject clear to "non-Arabists," but the author should be warmly commended both for his devotion to a task which no older scholar has been heretofore willing to undertake and for his success in its execution. The book is, as the title suggests, divided into three portions of unequal length. The fact that the first, on constitutional development, is named last on the title-page suggests the conclu-

sion that Professor Macdonald means to lay least stress upon this phase of his subject ; if so, his resolve will be a disappointment to the historical students who look to these pages for such enlightenment as a trained scholar in Islamic literature and philosophy can furnish upon its structure and political history. After a concise but admirable account of the famous constitution of Umar — whose more familiar name of Omar the purists are not likely to change for English readers — under the Republic, he concludes its downfall and the development of Empire under the Umayyads to be due to political and not to social-economic causes. It would be difficult to show this, though the first step in the progress, the elevation of Uthman to the califate was of course the result of political intrigue. But above all rivalries of sept and sect was the inevitable tendency of the victorious Arab state, when once convinced of its mission, to establish itself in some capital which would control the great trade-routes and renew the empire of either a Darius or an Alexander. It was natural that Muawiyeh should renew the latter's ambition in Syria, where the Umayyad influence was supreme and where the worth of the Roman domain around the Mediterranean visibly affected the Arab imagination. But when the attempt failed within the space of a century, the clan that had tried and lost succumbed in civil war to another which reestablished the Achæmenid empire with very passable and enduring success. Islam as a governing instrument must have under these circumstances been influenced first by Hellenic and subsequently by Persian ideas. Their extent and prevalence are not, however, made as evident in the first portion as the historical reader might wish. It is interesting to note that so good an observer of the Muslim of to-day as Professor Macdonald agrees with certain English publicists in sounding the alarm over the reforming and puritanic Brotherhood of as-Sanusi which "for years has gathered arms and munitions and trained men for the great Jihad" against Europe.

The part of this work devoted to jurisprudence makes the inextricable interlacing of Church and State in Islam more clearly apparent. To be a statesman in the Muslim world means also to be a jurist and theologian ; their law "takes all duty for its portion and defines all action in terms of duty. Nothing can escape the narrow meshes of its net," and the captions of a typical law-code translated in the appendix furnish suggestive testimony to this statement. Mohammed's own contribution to the legal system of Islam is called the only legislation it has ever had, and this was of the most fortuitous sort. After his death began a process of arranging and correlating such decisions as were found in the Koran or remembered by his companions, and when these failed recourse was had to the common-sense of the judge. A certain sanctity attends the decisions of the first four califs that renders them hardly inferior to the Traditions or to the divine Word itself. But sticklers for the law and tradition of this narrow sort were inevitably overwhelmed in the tide of conquest during the first century after the hegira by the necessities of erecting a complete and stable system of justice for a vast empire. From the courts in Syria, which were allowed to continue until the conquerors

had learned their lesson, Muslims acquired the fundamental principles of Roman law, the parent law of the world, while a natural process of further development was secured in the "opinions" of those speculative Muslim lawyers whose *Responsa* came presently to represent equity in its strict sense. It was not until the Abbasid period that the canon law of Islam was practically completed and made, like that of the Roman church in Catholic states, the law of the land. Then arose the inevitable struggle between adherents of usage and of tradition; and the consequent schools and parties all closely intermingled with subtleties of theological speculation, of which indeed they were necessarily a part. For clear and logical presentation in brief space this explanation of Muslim law has no equal in our language.

Into the obscure and difficult subject of Muslim theology, occupying nearly two-thirds of the book, there is no need to enter here. The volume is a much-needed and welcome addition to the scanty materials for an understanding of Islam by English readers.

FREDERICK WELLS WILLIAMS.

Mediæval India under Mohammedan Rule (712-1764). By STANLEY LANE-POOLE, M.A., Litt. D., M.R.I.A. [The Story of the Nations.] (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1903. Pp. xviii, 449.)

THOUGH some might question the propriety of calling the millennium which ends with the nineteenth century the middle ages of so long a history as that of India, there can be no doubt of its convenience as an easily defined period for treatment in an historical series. Professor Lane-Poole would probably be among the first to concede that the romantic adventure of Mohammed Kasim in Sind was no real beginning of Islam either as cult or government in India. Mohammedan rule was not effectively established there until three centuries later, and then only slowly and in part. As a prelude, however, suggestive alike of Arab daring and defects, this raid is properly enough a portion of the story of Mohammedan India. The first book of the three into which this volume is divided concludes with an account of the successive onslaughts from Afghanistan during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and the ultimate conquest of the Ganges basin; the hundred pages of Book II. are devoted to the various dynasties ruling from Delhi as their capital during three centuries; while the remainder of the volume, more than half, describes the Mogul Empire. For the purposes of an historical sketch designed for general reading this grouping is highly satisfactory. It emphasizes adequately the successive stages in a long process of subjection and imperfect assimilation, leaving out of view a multitude of minor occurrences, but making clear the great personages whose achievements and characters fashioned the course of events.

Like most students of oriental history, the author—who is in the very first rank of these—frankly estimates the account of this period as "necessarily more a chronicle of kings and courts and conquests than of

organic or national growth." It is preëminently the view of Asiatics themselves, who have of course been the furnishers of most of our sources on their own history. But it may yet be found as true of Asia as of Europe that outside of or, rather, behind the wars and vanities, the traits and ceremonies of the leaders, a society is apt to be directed in the long run by habits and desires of its own. These may not attain definite institutional shape, yet they are factors of growth quite apart from the element of individual caprice. The appearance of Mamelukes and slave kings in Egypt as in Hindustan is an instance of the working of an institution, not of an accident. In societies which are ever demanding chiefs who control, the slave system in the east tends to produce great men. As the author observes in his study of Saladin, "a slave is often held to be better than a son. The great slave vassals of the Seljuks were as proud and honorable as any bastards of Mediæval aristocracy; and when they in turn assumed kingly powers they inherited and transmitted to their lineage the high traditions of their former lords." Other examples might be adduced.

It is, nevertheless, as a portrayal of the individual that Professor Lane-Poole succeeds best in this as in some of his other books. He is the master of an excellent English style, and has strong human sympathies and an eye for the picturesque combined with full knowledge of his subject. There need be no disparagement in adding that this knowledge was presumably complete enough for him to construct a book like this almost offhand. To one of his scholarship, whose monographs on Baber and Aurangzib in Hunter's "Indian Empire Series" have exhibited also a good perception of historical method, fresh and special studies for such a work would be even excessive. But the result — whatever the preparation — is one of the most graphic, trustworthy, and best sustained volumes in this long and generally creditable popular series. In such sketches as those of Balban, Ala-ad-din, or the terrible Taghlak, in the earlier portion of the book, the typical Asiatic war-lord and executioner is painted with rare appreciation and vigor, while each of the Great Moguls is given space sufficient for us to realize in what the glory of that extraordinary half-dozen consisted. The author is singularly lenient with some matters usually condemned, such as Mohammed Taghlak's wild experiment with his brass tokens; possibly his numismatic learning may account for this as for the numerous coins portrayed throughout these pages; but we should have expected him to deal more severely than he does with the drunken Jahangir and the religious vagaries of Akbar. The numerous illustrations, mainly from architectural photographs, add appreciably to the value of a most readable book.

FREDERICK WELLS WILLIAMS.

The Papal Monarchy, from St. Gregory the Great to Boniface VIII.
(590-1303.) [The Story of the Nations.] By WILLIAM
BARRY, D.D. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; London:
T. Fisher Unwin. 1902. Pp. xxii, 435.)

As indicated by the title and the dates, this work aims to emphasize one great phase of the history of the Christian church, the papal monarchy succeeding the Roman Empire and becoming for two thousand years the teacher and guide of barbarous and dismembered Europe, and forming a Christendom. It is that portion of church history when the papacy in addition to its original and necessary attributes assumed, and to a considerable extent maintained a temporal overlordship in western Europe. This began in some sort with Gregory the Great, and with the defeat of Boniface VIII. by the new national power in France the "temporal power, in this magnificent application of the word, has passed away." Setting forth in the first two chapters with considerable clearness and force the beginnings of papal history and the scope and purpose of the book, the author does not fail in many places thereafter to point and emphasize his theme; his knowledge of church history through the best authorities is abundantly apparent; and a general air of scholarly fairness and reserve is found throughout. Despite this the book as a whole is unsatisfactory; it tends to confusion. For a person with small previous knowledge of European history it would be of little value; for one who has the knowledge there are some valuable hints and interesting points of view, but large portions of the work are of no value whatever. The detail and complexity of papal history, the necessity which the author feels himself under of at least naming every pope and saying a few words about him, the vast number of matters in the history of various European countries that have to be mentioned without possibility of full explanation—these difficulties prove too much for his powers of condensation, selection, and emphasis. The book strongly illustrates the impossibility of a successful treatment of papal history apart from the general history of Europe, especially that of the Empire. A work like this has to take a knowledge of such history for granted; and if a person has that knowledge, he knows inevitably nearly everything that this book has to teach, and he has acquired it in a more natural way; he has escaped a deal of useless detail, has learned the great facts of papal history in their proper relations, and hence has a truer, more vivid, and more abiding conception of them.

The author is constantly emphasizing the fact that the Reformation and Protestantism stand for ideas and tendencies present in Europe in varying degrees all through the middle ages: Becket for England and St. Francis for Europe in general are regarded as delaying the Reformation for three centuries (pp. 277 and 313-314); the Constitutions of Clarendon are likened to Henry VIII.'s antipapal legislation (p. 272); Gerbert of Rheims was "a Protestant and Reformer, some centuries too soon" (p. 175).

In matters outside of church history there are many errors and mis-judgments: Philip of Swabia is spoken of as "usurping his nephew's inheritance" (p. 290); the rights of Magna Carta come "down from old Teutonic customs and precedents" (p. 319); Simon de Montfort "laid the foundations of a free English Parliament" (p. 352); "It was a principle of Magna Charta that the crown could not raise taxes without the consent of Parliament" (p. 398).

A. B. WHITE.

The Cambridge Modern History. Planned by LORD ACTON, LL.D.

Edited by A. W. WARD, G. W. PROTHERO, STANLEY LEATHES.

In twelve volumes. Volume I. The Renaissance. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1902. Pp. xxx, 807.)

THE first volume of the *Cambridge Modern History* was awaited with much interest, and has been accepted on all sides with evidences of high appreciation. It is truly a work of great compass and erudition. Six hundred and ninety-two pages of text, the contributions in many instances of men of international reputation and acknowledged merit, supplemented with one hundred pages of classified bibliography, are a notable addition to the literature of the Renaissance. We shall be willing to admit, at the outset, that the work has been carefully and accurately done. The most unfavorable judgment that could be rendered would still pronounce it an extensive and valuable collection of material for the better understanding of the Renaissance period; the most favorable view would regard it as a triumph of the art of coöperative historical writing.

The first instalment of the *Cambridge Modern History* comes to hand at a time when much interest is being felt in this subject of coöperative writing; when the results of several enterprises in the past have left the impression that success has yet to be achieved, and the announcements of various projects for the future have given notice that the effort is to be continued under more promising conditions. The editors, in their preface, and Dr. Creighton, in the introductory chapter, have frankly set forth the dangers and advantages of the coöperative plan. On the one hand, the difficulty of bringing the individual contributors into a scheme of harmonious development, and of preserving a just proportion in the arrangement of the several parts, together with the dangers of omission and of duplication, are serious obstacles to be overcome. Against this we have the manifest advantages of a subdivision of labor, with all that this implies, the enthusiasm of specialists, their accuracy, and a certain freshness of style and vigor of touch which comes from an intimate acquaintance with the facts at the outset of the enterprise.

The question arises, how far have the editors succeeded in overcoming the difficulties which have been enumerated? That they have secured many if not all of the advantages claimed for the system is evident. The editors modestly avow their belief "that the present work may, without presumption, aim higher than its predecessors, and may seek to be something more than a useful compilation or than a standard work of reference," that it may be "a narrative which is not a mere

string of episodes, but display a continuous development." Such a consummation would imply, no doubt, the arrival at the point proposed by the coöperative plan. It could be achieved only by a triumph of editorship, such a control and disposition of the coöperating forces as would ensure the welding of the component parts into a complete and harmonious whole. That this has been accomplished we may be permitted to doubt; that a substantial step has been taken in the direction of the realization of the ideal may be admitted. In many earlier series the function of the editorial body has been limited to the selection of contributors, a formal apportionment of the work, and a general censorial supervision. The success of coöperative editing, if it shall ever become an unqualified success, demands something more than this. It demands an editorial activity of the most positive sort, a central power to whose judgment the contributors shall yield, not in questions of historical fact, but on all points relating to the disposition and correlation of material. Such editors, it is hardly necessary to say, are rare. The late Lord Acton, by whom the plan of the *Cambridge Modern History* was "conceived and mapped out," was, by all accounts, such a man. His untimely death, before the task of weaving the several threads of narrative into the fabric he had designed had been fairly begun, was a serious blow, and has left us without means to arrive at a knowledge of the measure of perfection to which the project, in his hands, might have been brought. That his successors have attained to so high a point of success, in what must have been in many respects an ungrateful task, speaks highly for their editorial ability.

In measuring the advance that has been made by the Cambridge volume along the line of coöperative editing, we naturally turn to institute a comparison with two other great series which have attempted to deal in a somewhat similar manner with periods of history more or less parallel. These are the "Oncken series," generally so designated, and the *Histoire Générale*. Of the three sets the *Cambridge Modern History* is by far the most comprehensive. In the Oncken series the whole subject of the Renaissance was assigned to a well-known authority, Ludwig Geiger; in the *Histoire Générale*, where the division of labor more nearly approaches the method of the Cambridge series, the list of contributors includes men whose interest in the main subject is well recognized, as, for example, M. Gebhart, and in the domain of art, MM. Michel and Lavoix. It is a curious fact that of all the contributors to the volume under examination not one has ever been especially associated with the subject of the Renaissance, if we except Mr. Horatio Brown, who is a recognized authority on Venetian history. If it were the purpose of the projectors to prepare a collection of monographs with a view of supplementing our knowledge of the Renaissance, this selection of contributors might prove to be a positive advantage, importing into the accumulated discussion of the subject a certain freshness of view, which would afford an acceptable enlargement of the conventional treatment of the subject. In a history of the Renaissance, however, intended to

be complete in itself, and committed to a scheme of "continuous development," the method is, perhaps, open to criticism.

The work of Ludwig Geiger differs from the present volume in other vital respects. It includes a discussion of the art of the Renaissance, as, indeed, does the *Histoire Générale*; but it is of additional value from the fact that it is abundantly furnished with illustrations, selected in accordance with the severest canons that govern the illustration of historical books. The editors of the Cambridge series stopped short of this, regarding it as an extension of the scope of the work, "which considerations of space compel us to renounce." It is, to say the least, a misfortune that such considerations compelled them to forego the advantage which might have been conserved by the use of maps. It seems late in the day for a great work of general interest to deprive its readers of those additional means of acquiring information that recent invention has made so easily available. Those who use the Cambridge series—and they are likely to be many—will regret that a moderate amount of illustration was not provided for by a curtailment of an immoderate amount of political information.

If we compare the text of the Cambridge *Renaissance* with the text devoted to the same period in the *Histoire Générale*, it will be evident that the former excels greatly in the volume of its facts, the latter in the coördination of facts and in the suggestiveness of its conclusions. In the Cambridge volume a conscientious effort has been made to collect, under the topics treated, all the important facts that are at hand. The *Histoire Générale* is more economical and more discriminating in its selection, while the individuality of the contributor's point of view and the ripeness of his judgment are particularly grateful to the student. Indeed, it seems the habit of the Cambridge book, a habit which it possesses in common with many German historical works, to collect and present the facts, permitting the reader to draw his own generalizations. The French, on the other hand, coördinate the facts, evolve the general idea, which they illustrate with selected instances. Both methods have their merits, and the selection of one or the other will depend upon the class of readers for whose benefit the work is planned.

The arrangement of topics in the Cambridge volume is likely to excite surprise and elicit a variety of opinions. The editors assert that they are not to be tied by the necessities of chronological sequence. No objection can be urged against this determination, provided that the chronological arrangement gives way to something more useful. The usual method of presenting the subject in books on the Renaissance has been somewhat as follows: first, a general review of the political and social conditions of the times; second, the development of what might be termed the spirit of the Renaissance, usually defined in periods of progression; third, the application of this spirit of the Renaissance to the problems and affairs of human life and activity. This is the course which, in a general way, has been pursued by Symonds, Burckhardt, and Villari. It has no special sanction otherwise, and might be set aside at

any time for something better. The Cambridge editors have established a new arrangement. On opening the book the reader is surprised to find Chapters I. and II. devoted respectively to "The Age of Discovery" and "The New World," narrating events which took place at a time when, according to the conventional view of the period, the Renaissance was drawing to a close. Putting chronology aside, it is difficult to conceive of any method of topical treatment that justifies the location, in advance of a discussion of the manner in which the Renaissance spirit arose and became influential, of events that must be regarded as a product of this spirit.

The proportions of the work differ materially from other histories of the Renaissance in the relatively large space given to political history, fourteen out of the nineteen chapters of the book. Of the remaining chapters, Chapter XVI., "The Classical Renaissance," by Professor Jebb; Chapter XVII., "The Christian Renaissance," by Dr. M. R. James; and Chapter XVIII., "Catholic Europe," by Dr. William Barry, in all 120 pages, cover that portion of the work which might be described as treating of the rise and progress of the spirit of the Renaissance. Chapter XV., by Dr. Cunningham, is devoted to "Economic Change," and Chapter XIX., by Mr. Lea, is entitled "The Eve of the Reformation." This overweighing on the side of political history, to the detriment of the intellectual, the social, and the economic, is accounted for by the editors in the statement that the "first volume is not merely intended to describe and discuss the Renaissance . . . but is also designed as an introductory volume, whose business it is, as it were, to bring upon the stage the nations, forces, and interests which will bear the chief parts in the action" (*i. e.* of the series at large). It may be doubted, however, if this sad necessity wholly accounts for the disproportion. Much might be attributed to the insatiable thirst for political facts that is characteristic of the gentlemen in charge of the enterprise, and to their indifference to the more succulent parts of the story of mankind — predilections which have been shown more than once in recent English historical publications, notably in the arid stretches of the "Periods of European History."

The subject of proportion leads to the final query as to whether the volume fairly represents the whole range of interests associated with the Renaissance. "Politics, economics, and social life" are indicated as the chief concern of the series; art and literature are consciously relegated to separate and special works. The reader will soon find, however, that politics has really succeeded in crowding his associates from the tent. Economics, as represented in a chapter of fifty pages, has the advantage of an exceptionally able interpreter in Dr. Cunningham. So far as social history is concerned, no special chapters are devoted to the subject. It is woven, to be sure a meager thread, throughout the chapters on Italy and Spain: a few pages in Mr. Armstrong's chapter on "Florence: Savonarola" (V.); a brief mention of the life of the people in Dr. Brown's "Venice" (VIII.), in Mr. Burd's "Florence: Machiavelli" (VI.), in Dr. Garnett's "Rome and the Temporal Power" (VII.), and

in Professor Tout's "Germany and the Empire" (IX.); in Mr. Leathes's "France" (XII.), and in Dr. Ward's "The Netherlands" (XIII.) something more. Any effort to depict the life and sentiments of the Italian middle class, such as suggested by Burckhardt in his use of Alberti's *Trattato del Governo della Famiglia*, so important for correcting our estimate of Renaissance morality, is wholly wanting. In his "Germany and the Empire" Professor Tout devotes a page (299) to the classes of society in Germany, but his main interest is in the effort for the reform of the imperial administration, which is especially well set forth.

It would be easy to suggest the addition of special chapters the absence of which is a serious limitation. A chapter on the art of war, describing the Condottieri, the rise of the Swiss infantry, the organization of the Lansquenets, the superiority of the Spanish armament, and the suggestions of Machiavelli for the organization of a Florentine militia, would have been in order. More important still would be a chapter on education in the Renaissance. Professor Jebb in Chapter XVI. has spoken briefly of Vittorino da Feltre and Guarino; but the development of a popular educational system in Germany, to which Janssen has so forcibly called our attention, has no representation, although abundant material is at hand in the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* (to mention one source), for the universities, and in the student autobiographies of the period, for the public schools.

The religious side of the Renaissance is well provided for. Dr. Barry, whose *Papal Monarchy* has been so well received, was a happy selection. In his chapter on "Catholic Europe" (XVIII.) he discusses the attitude of the Church toward the humanistic movement. It is a harbinger of the golden age of historical writing when we discover theological lions and lambs lying down together with impunity. Mr. Lea follows, and brings the book to a conclusion with a chapter entitled "The Eve of the Reformation" (XIX.). Mr. Lea's chapter, although filled with the results of that scholarly research which has won for the author first place in the ranks of living American historians, is disappointing to the student of the Renaissance. It is primarily concerned with the organization of the sixteenth-century church, and only incidentally with the attitude of the humanists toward the religious questions of the day. Of the forty pages which make up the chapter thirty are devoted to the evils of the Church. Of the value of this description opinions will differ. No one will doubt the accuracy of Mr. Lea's facts, but many will be inclined to question the correctness of the impression which the disposition of these facts produces upon the reader. The lurid picture of the vices of the papal court leaves it to be inferred that these vices were something inseparably connected with the clerical garb, and not the equally common attribute of all persons whose social eminence gave them the opportunity for indulgence. There is nothing here that suggests the opinion of Nicholas de Clemanges, himself a sharp critic of the abuses of the Church, when he remarks that, while there is much to condemn in

the papal court, yet, having a fair experience of many temporal courts, he can say that the papal court is the cleanest he has ever seen.

MERRICK WHITCOMB.

Histoire de France depuis les Origines jusqu'à la Révolution. (Publiée sous la Direction de M. Ernest Lavisse.) Tome V. Les Guerres d'Italie. La France sous Charles VIII, Louis XII et François I^{er} (1492-1547). Par HENRY LEMONNIER, Professeur à l'Université de Paris. (Paris : Hachette et Cie. 1903. Pp. 394.)

M. LEMONNIER has had a formidable task in writing the history of the reign of Louis XII. and Francis I., for aside from the complexity of the period, there are other real difficulties. Natures like that of Francis I., of Louise of Savoy, of Marguerite d'Angoulême, of the constable Bourbon are not easily estimated; the psychological element is large, the personal equation a very variable one. Then again, the difficulties attending a knowledge of the sources is great. One may reasonably hope to consult almost all the sources pertaining to most medieval themes. But it is not so with reference to a subject in a modern epoch, for the mass of materials is too voluminous. And in the history of the sixteenth century this difficulty is enhanced in two particulars. In the first place, the sources of the period are widely dispersed. Little care was then taken in France to preserve records, save in the case of the registers of the *parlements*. Each minister of state, each ambassador or other official guarded his own correspondence and disposed of it as he chose. Thus L'Aubespine, the bishop of Limoges, who was Catherine de Medici's ambassador to the court of Philip II., carried the correspondence of his office with him from point to point, and when the Spanish king returned to Spain in 1559 all these documents were lost by shipwreck. It was the administration of Richelieu which inaugurated the change by which documents of state and the doubles of correspondence were preserved in various *dépôts*. The mass of materials comprised in the *Fonds français* of the Bibliothèque Nationale and at the Archives Nationales, and the Collection Godefroy in the Bibliothèque de l'Institut has reduced the difficulties of the historian of the sixteenth century to a great degree. Yet it still remains true that, more than in almost any other period, the sources of the history of France in this period are scattered. Aside from the familiar seats of research in France and other countries, foreign archives more remote require to be visited. In Cracow are unpublished materials pertaining to Henry of Anjou's short and absurd reign as king of Poland; and nearer home, the archives in Besançon and the manuscripts in the Musée Condé at Chantilly must not be overlooked.

Still another embarrassment arises from the unsettled form of the language. The French language experienced a great expansion at this time, owing to the influence of the Renaissance, while as yet there were few settled rules of orthography. Moreover, it was exposed to an invasion of foreign words, especially Italian and Spanish, in consequence of which influences the historian of the sixteenth century cannot read the sources

of the period with that readiness which is possible of the documents of the seventeenth.

It goes without saying that so careful a scholar as M. Lemonnier has overcome these difficulties. But one remains, the failure to avoid which is no fault of his. The length and importance of the period from 1492 to 1547 makes it impossible adequately to treat its history within the compass of a single volume. In other words, the subject suffers from limitations of space. This volume is an *essence du travail*, the result of careful study of the many monographs that have been written upon various phases of the epoch, the whole illuminated by discriminating personal judgments. The work will probably remain for some time to come the authoritative history of Francis I. But every possessor of the volume will do well to have bound with it, if not otherwise preserved, the pages of the admirable bibliographical study of the reign of Francis I. by V.-L. Bourilly, published in the May and June numbers of the *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*.

M. Lemonnier's studies as a professor of art seem to have had a happy influence over his pen. He has the French gift of generalization and illustration—for example, the comparison of Genoa in 1500 with Poland in the eighteenth century; and he has also an incisive way of portraying men. Of Cardinal d'Amboise he caustically observes, "Ce personnage reste encore aujourd'hui plus célèbre que connu" (p. 42). Elsewhere he dilates upon the cardinal thus: "Sa politique fut mal inspirée; fausse dans son principe, mal agencée dans les combinaisons qu'elle mit en œuvre. Tout au plus peut-on dire qu'il y déploya une extraordinaire facilité à varier ses moyens d'action. Sa grande force fut sans doute dans le prestige dont il jouissait, et son mérite dans une certaine confiance en lui-même, qui lui donnait cette qualité, suprême réparatrice des fautes, la décision." The concluding sentence of a paragraph upon Anne of Brittany is, "Ni comme femme, ni comme reine, cette excellente Bretonne et mauvaise Française ne mérite les éloges qu'on a répétés sur son compte" (p. 46).

The two character-sketches that excel all others are those of Louis XII. and Francis I. (pp. 41-42; 188-197). Every student of French history will hope that M. Lemonnier has succeeded in destroying the myth that Louis XII. was either a good or a great king. His stupid duplicity in 1500, his blundering diplomacy in 1503, his terrible cruelty in war always, and the shameless method in which he pursued the annulment of his marriage with Jeanne of France constitute a dingy halo indeed. It is well said that "on juge combien il était gros de scandales, au milieu du scandale même de ce procès, qui mettait en cause la mémoire d'un roi et la dignité de toute la famille royale. L'information se poursuivait avec une régularité extérieure de procédure, qui est bien un trait de l'époque et qui ajoute encore à l'hypocrisie de l'acte" (p. 44). One wishes that the author had enlarged more upon certain particulars of Louis XII.'s reign, giving less space to the exploits of a decadent chivalry, especially since "tous ces exploits servaient de peu" (p. 62).

M. Lemonnier fails to emphasize sufficiently the point that Louis XII.'s policy at the council of Bologna was due more to his determination to abase the horns of the pope than to zeal for reform. Again, the peculiar autonomy enjoyed by Burgundy and Brittany practically forced a moderate provincial policy upon the king, but the influence exercised by this fact is unnoticed. The reviewer, at least, cannot help regretting these lacunae in the face of what seems to be an undue amount of military narration. One is prepared to admit the military genius of Gaston de Foix, as so admirably set forth (pp. 98-104), but the account of Bayard's prowess in duels and other feats of arms might safely have been left to the pages of *Le Loyal Serviteur*.

Some of M. Lemonnier's judgments have a piercing keenness, as when he says of Ludovico Sforza: "Les Italiens du XVI^e siècle ont eu pour sa politique un respect incroyable; preuve de plus que le condottierisme était au fond de l'âme italienne" (p. 11). Others are likely to be challenged by his readers, notably his conviction of the poverty of Italian political conceptions — "notre Europe politique ou sociale n'est en rien sortie de là" (p. 12) — and the view that Julius II. inaugurated nothing (pp. 111-112).

The bibliographies appended to each chapter are, as usual, excellent. But one doubts if the volumes of the *Calendar of State Papers* edited by Bergenroth and Dr. Brewer have been actually consulted in the composition of this work; for the evidence of Ferdinand the Catholic's own correspondence belies the statement on page 72 that Queen Isabella of her own will left the government of Castile to Ferdinand, to the detriment of her daughter Juana and her son-in-law, Philip of Burgundy.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

The Philippine Islands, 1493-1803. Translations from contemporaneous books and manuscripts. Edited and annotated by EMMA HELEN BLAIR and JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON, with historical introduction and additional notes by EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE. Vol. I., 1493-1529; Vol. II., 1529-1569; Vol. III., 1569-1576; Vol. IV., 1576-1581; Vol. V., 1582-1583. To be complete in fifty-five volumes. (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company. 1903. Pp. 6-358; 4-335; 8-316; 6-317; 8-320.)

FIVE volumes have now appeared of this, the most important and extensive undertaking ever made in Philippine history. Volume I. is chiefly occupied, besides the notable historical introduction of Professor Bourne, covering some ninety pages, with documents relating to the famous "Demarcation Line" by which Pope Alexander VI. sought to divide the world between Portugal and Spain. Though entirely pertinent (the desire to reach spice islands by a western route led to Magellan's famous voyage of discovery), one feels that it was not strictly necessary to go so in detail into the documentary history of this never-settled

controversy. The remainder of this volume contains some documents relating to Magellan's voyage, of which the most valuable is the letter of Maximilianus Transylvanus, then a student in Spain, narrating the story of the voyage brought by its few survivors, the handful who really first circumnavigated the globe. Volume II. contains synopses of documents pertaining to the unsuccessful voyages of Loaisa and Villalobos, and brings us into the real beginnings of Spanish-Philippine history with the account of the successful expedition of Legaspi, resulting in a permanent settlement at Cebu in 1565. It were to be wished that the editors had more diligently searched the archives for this period; for the information to be gleaned from what they have presented to us, though considerable, especially in the letters of Legaspi to King Philip II., is all too meager. Volume III. gives us documentary accounts of the conquest of Manila and part of Luzon; considerable about their people and the Chinese; some further accounts of the trouble with the Portuguese, who claimed the Philippines as "within their demarcation"; and hints as to the beginnings of missionary work by the friars and as to the earliest conflicts of authority and opinion between friars and lay authorities in the islands. In Volume IV. the matters of *encomiendas* for the Spanish conquerors and of the tribute to be paid by the natives are further threshed over, and the beginnings of Spain's vacillating policy of conquest among the Moros of the South Philippines are very adequately presented. In Volume V., dealing with the two years after the arrival of the first Philippine bishop, Domingo de Salazar — sometimes called "the las Casas of the Philippines" for his protests against enslaving the natives under the form of tribute or under the *encomiendas* — we are launched more fully into the conflict between civil and ecclesiastical authorities, a conflict which thereafter never ceased, except for brief spells, until the close of Spanish rule in the Philippines. Among the documents of Volume V. also is the "Relation" by Miguel de Loarca of the Philippine islands and people as thus far (up to 1582) conquered and known by the Spaniards. This is the most informative document yet produced in this series. It covers one hundred and fifty-five pages of old Spanish text and translation, side by side.

By making the statement that this series will, when completed, constitute the most important as well as the most extensive work ever published in Philippine history, it is not meant to imply that the printed material at the disposal of the student of Philippine history is slight. The editors of this series found themselves confronted at the very outset with a vast amount of such material, which was the more confusing in that it was so ill-assorted and undigested. They set themselves the task not only of assorting this material, but also of selecting for the student and statesman the significant data to be gleaned from the archives, particularly those of Seville, rich in Philippina. To choose out of this mass of printed and documentary sources the data of vital interest as bearing on Spanish colonial administration and as revealing the life and characteristics of the millions of Malays with whom we now have to deal,

and "whom we must understand if we would do them justice," is indeed, as Professor Bourne says in the introduction, "an undertaking large in its possibilities for the public good." The printed sources are almost wholly in Spanish, and not readily available even to him who reads that language, as most of the important works were issued in small editions and are rare and difficult to obtain. And he who examines these sources at all carefully will perceive that no real scholarly work, of the sort which the modern historical investigator deems worthy the name of scholarship, has ever been done in Philippine history, and will at once decide that the bulk of this work remains to be done among the manuscripts to be brought to light in the Spanish colonial archives and elsewhere. These considerations will help us to understand how ambitious is the undertaking these editors have set for themselves in the very first half-decade of American occupation of the Philippines. Indeed, the conviction is forced upon us by an inspection of the prospectus and of the volumes thus far issued, that the editors themselves have not fully appreciated the magnitude of the task they set themselves.

Right at the outset it is evident that they have been dependent upon the previously accepted authorities in Philippine history. This was inevitable, since there has not been time for that independent examination of the material which alone could enable them to deal authoritatively with it. One may say that this is of less importance in a work which aims mainly at the republication of documentary sources, and not at the independent writing of history, with its statement of conclusions and decisions between conflicting data. Nevertheless, in such a field as that of Philippine history, interwoven from the first with a great controversy, viz., that over the predominance of the religious orders, it is vitally necessary that editorial work be based on an independently equipped judgment.

It is not enough that there should be freedom from bias. These editors assure us of their desire to preserve an impartial attitude as between the sides of a three-century-old conflict; and there can be no doubt as to the honesty of their intentions in this respect. Nevertheless, they have, in the absence of an ability to judge independently as to the material which is most trustworthy and most significant for this work, been obliged to rely on existing authorities. Unfortunately for them, Philippine history has been written almost exclusively by friars or by writers with a pro-friar bias. A Jesuit would center Philippine history about the doings of his brotherhood; a Dominican would glorify his order at the expense of its rivals, until one must sift and compare and reconcile conflicting statements to get at the real truth, while much that is highly significant has been omitted or glossed over. Moreover, a good portion of the unpublished sources of Philippine history is in the friar archives of Spain and the Philippines; and it is the simple truth to say that it has not always been and is not now being handled with candor; so that, with intentions unquestionably the best, the editors of this work have already been led to betray a pro-friar bias. This has inevitably come

about through their dependence on others in the selection of material for reproduction and through the lack of sufficient preparation to annotate the documents already published in a way that would enable the reader new to Philippina to judge of their relative worth and properly to estimate the data they present.

It is regrettable that this criticism must be offered — all the more so, as the friar controversy is still being waged in this country; and any expression upon it always leads to the imputation of unfairness. It is all very well to say that the editor of such a work as this must not appear to know either side to a controversy, must, as nearly as possible, ignore its existence. But the friar controversy is writ so large all over Philippine history and has so distorted it in its written form, that one is simply compelled to take it into account at every stage. But one comprehensive piece of work has been done in this subject that was not open to the charge of a friar bias, viz., the three-volume history of Montero y Vidal, and that is a mere striz of chronicles, with little pretension to scholarship.

Evidently, large research in the archives of Philippina is necessary, if independent and satisfactory work is to be done. It is precisely that research in which the work here under discussion, at least in the volumes thus far issued, is deficient. There are rehearsed to us in these five volumes mainly the conventional documents referred to in histories written later on. Fortunately, there is plenty of time during the three or four years to come, while the succeeding volumes are appearing, to remedy this defect, to some extent at least. One should hesitate to express too harsh a judgment; and yet we are practically limited to the volumes at hand for an opinion on the undertaking. Moreover, the prospectus for the later portions of the work shows many important omissions of documents not to be obtained except by search outside of friar sources.

If criticisms are to be offered on the editors' selection of material, there is, as hinted, not less criticism to be passed on the annotations, or lack of annotations. Herein particularly are the volumes thus far issued weak (in addition to minor mistakes caused by a too servile following of Retana and other often fallible authorities); and the student without other means of reaching judgments on the early period of Spanish rule would be subject to various errors as well as to much confusion. That the statements made in the foregoing few paragraphs have not been overdrawn is evidenced by these remarks in the preface to Volume V.:

The coming (in 1581) of the zealous and intrepid bishop, Domingo de Salazar, was a red-letter day for the natives of the islands. The Spanish conquerors are ruthlessly oppressing the Indians, caring but little for the opposition made by the friars; but Salazar exerts as far as possible, his ecclesiastical authority, and, besides, vigorously urges the king to shield these unfortunate victims of Spanish rapacity. Various humane laws are accordingly enacted for the protection of the natives, but of course this interference by the bishop occasions a bitter hostility between the ecclesiastical and the secular powers — perhaps never to be quieted.

That Salazar was indeed zealous in behalf of the natives, and that the friars in the early days, the "heroic period" of missionary work,

were in general protectors as well as zealous mentors of the natives, is true; but the inferences to be drawn by the uninformed from the above editorial statements are unwarranted. The controversy between secular and ecclesiastical authorities began before Salazar's arrival, and the friars were not always in the right nor the lay conquerors always oppressors; instance the desire of the missionaries to abandon the toilsome labors of the Philippines for the more attractive and glorious field in China, as soon as they arrived at Manila from Mexico, and the check put upon this movement by the secular authorities.

And what shall we say of Professor Bourne's introduction? In many respects the most complete and scholarly monograph on Philippine history yet published in English, and evincing diligent and quite extensive reading in the subject, it yet perfectly illustrates the danger of relying on the existing sources of authority. With Professor Bourne's estimate of the work of the friars in what he calls their "golden age," it would not be easy seriously to disagree. But when he charges the decline in purity of government, in economic progressiveness, and in industrial and social development in general, from 1700 onward, entirely upon the "inept bureaucracy" of Spain, and declares that the friars did what they could to remedy the mistakes of the civil administrators, he becomes a literal follower of the friar writers, belied as their statements are by the plain record of the past two centuries. The orders ruled in Spain and in the Philippines until forty years ago, and often thereafter, and they mapped out general policies and ruthlessly supervised details; it is plain justice to hold them to responsibility for the results.

Professor Bourne has done the Filipino people many injustices in his acceptance of pro-friar authorities, none other of them greater than his gratuitous fling at José Rizal, borrowed from the industrious but much-biased Philippine bibliographer W. E. Retana, who has repeatedly been taxed with being a hireling of the friars. Similar is his acceptance of the most careless statements made by recent writers about the state of the Filipinos as a "set of savages" at the time of Spanish conquest.

One might wish that this series had been prefaced with documents bearing upon the state of pre-conquest Filipinos. Such documents as Loarca's relation (Volume V.) in part supply this defect. The first task the modern historian of these people must set himself is to ascertain the state of culture of these Malays at the coming of Magellan, as a basis for an estimate on the work of the conquerors, if for no broader reasons. For this purpose he must, as in the case of modern investigation into the state of prehistoric Mexican culture, needs go, in every way possible, beyond the careless statements of unscientific and prejudiced Spanish conquerors, lay or ecclesiastical. Here lies a most difficult but a most interesting piece of work for the modern investigator. Had José Rizal lived, there is hope that it would at least have been undertaken in a satisfactory way.

As now planned, this series will end with the eighteenth century. It was thought that the sources for nineteenth-century Philippine history

are more readily accessible in printed form. This is true; nevertheless a service would be performed by going outside the beaten track for the significant unprinted data bearing on this period, when events were shaping themselves for Spain's downfall, so remarkably predicted in 1859 by the German traveler in the Philippines, Ferdinand Jagor. The work is being put forth in very suitable form, neatly and plainly bound, on deckle-edged paper, with gilt top. Bibliographic data are appended to each volume, and we are promised a final volume containing a full bibliography and analytical index. The illustrations, reproductions of old paintings, facsimiles of documents and rare maps, have thus far been very satisfactory. That the editors of this work have launched it without time for sufficient preparation is the criticism to be made upon it; and a serious criticism it is. But it could not fail to be a most valuable series, from every point of view, at this moment in our national history, and especially in view of the almost total lack of available publications on Philippine history in the English language. With every reasonable prospect for more and more effective editorial work in the succeeding volumes, it is to be said that the volumes already out seem to make the work one indispensable to every well-equipped reference library in the United States.

JAMES A. LEROY.

London in the Eighteenth Century. By SIR WALTER BESANT. (London: Adam and Charles Black; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1903. Pp. xvii, 667.)

It was the aim of the late Sir Walter Besant to do for the London of the nineteenth century what Stow in his classic *Survey* did for the sixteenth. To that end he planned a great coöperative work, in which he reserved to himself the task of writing a general history of the city. Though his share of the undertaking was practically completed before his death, it was thought best, for various reasons, to publish in the present volume only the portion relating to the eighteenth century. This history contains the ripest fruits of Sir Walter's labors: indeed, we are told that he "was wont to refer to it as his *magnum opus*, and it was the work by which he most desired to be remembered by posterity." To attempt in a brief review to give an adequate idea of the wealth of information contained in the stately quarto now before us would result in a "mere aggregate of bewildered jottings." Consequently it will be necessary to restrict ourselves to a bare indication of the classes of subjects treated and to a few references to some of the more striking facts and conclusions.

Besant had already shown in his *Chaplain of the Fleet* and *All Sorts and Conditions of Men* that he knew and loved his London as few men have known and loved it. For over thirty years he was engaged in reading and taking notes on the social side of London life, not only in the present but in the past. The results of this patient accumulation are grouped and presented in this posthumous work with the practiced novelist's eye for picturesque effect, though the general symmetry is marred

here and there by repetitions and incongruous heapings of irrelevant facts. Moreover, though the book on the whole appears to be trustworthy, as well as intensely interesting, one should not look here for a cautious and critical sifting of material and a precise gaging of sources of information. The author's methods are not those of the trained historian, and he frankly disarms criticism in this respect. "If it were required," he says, "to name authorities for any statement advanced, or to give reasons for any conclusions, I could not probably do so, since the authority would lie hidden in some obscure history or some long-forgotten tedious novel." The following example will illustrate the occasional ingenuousness of his historical method. After telling a curious story of how the Spanish and Portuguese Jews burned their valuable library in Bevis Marks (p. 194), he adds: "I give the story as it is related in the *Gentlemen's Magazine*. I confess that the thing itself, as it is related, seems to me to be incredible." In the preface (p. x) he gives a list of his chief authorities. Dates and places of publication are not indicated, but this omission is not so serious, since there are almost no specific page references cited in the body of the text.

The first section of the work is devoted to a series of "historical notes," a selection of twenty characteristic episodes in the history of eighteenth-century London, ranging from the Great Storm of 1703 to the Reform Bill of 1832. The author oversteps his chronological limits advisedly, very properly regarding the era of reform immediately preceding the Victorian age as more fitting than the year 1800 for a line of demarcation between the new century and the old. Having completed his brief and fragmentary but picturesque historical introductory sketch, he proceeds to his more especial work of reconstructing in a most minute and lifelike fashion the condition of London and the life of its people during the period in question. This exhaustive survey is arranged under six sections: the city and the streets; church and chapel; government and trade; manners and customs; society and amusements; crime, police, justice, and debtor's prisons. Literature is not included, since that subject was to be reserved for a separate treatment.

The city seems to have opposed the Crown in almost every point of public policy, in the American war and the war with France, in supporting Queen Caroline and in supporting Parliamentary reform. Nevertheless, the city's attitude counted for little, owing to its decline "in dignity, position, and influence." The system of government and administration is treated in some detail, and much light is thrown on the state of trade. From the chapter on trade unions it is evident that considerable discontent existed among the working classes. Likewise it is encouraging to learn that even a century ago masters and mistresses had no end of trouble with their domestics. The list of trades, banks, and newspapers (pp. 392-396) furnishes valuable data.

In an age when religion was at a low ebb throughout the country, when upper classes were worldly and skeptical, when the lower classes were sunk in degrading vice, there seems to have been no little religious

feeling among the city middle class, and this was not confined to the dissenters alone. Certainly there was a very decided degree of outward observance, if we may judge from the frequency of church services, and the popularity of a certain type of theological literature. In strange contrast, the men drank deeply, while card-playing, even among women, was excessive: perhaps inevitable counter-irritants to the prevailing monotony. Some amusing extracts from the diary of one Thomas Turner (pp. 240-242) furnish an intimate introduction to the daily life of the period.

There was no end of amusements for those who had the leisure and inclination to indulge in them — amusements, however, which apparently appealed in general only to the two extremes of society. From May to October no fewer than eighty-two days were given over to fairs. In theory at least, holy days had ceased to be regarded by the sober tradesmen and merchants; for, with the exception of Christmas and Easter Monday, craftsmen were entitled only to Sundays. This restriction, however, did not apply to public officials, who enjoyed as many as ten movable and forty-one fixed holidays. Moreover, the craftsmen were accustomed to take more than their allotted two days. November 17, the anniversary of Elizabeth's accession, was the occasion for antipapal demonstrations, while May 29, the day of the Restoration, was long celebrated. Theaters flourished: it is said there were twice as many in London as in Paris. In the city proper, however, there never was a stage, except possibly the inn-yard where Tarleton acted.

It is a sharp transition from amusements, from coffee-houses and clubs, both of which latter, by the way, are admirably treated, to the somber topics of disease, poverty, and crime. The state of public health was appalling, most particularly in the case of infant mortality, it being estimated that over 50 per cent. of the children died under the age of 5 years. Statistics are cited to show that of a population of 10,000,000 in England and Wales there were 80,000 criminals and 1,040,716 objects of parish relief. Begging and the desertion of children prevailed to a startling extent. Mendicants deliberately made capital of the most revolting deformities. The iniquities in the employment of juvenile chimney-sweeps were not only unchecked but unregarded till the famous report presented June 22, 1817. The lot of the insane and of those treated as such was especially grievous. Numberless instances are cited of persons confined in private madhouses by those anxious to be rid of them. As if the condition of the public institutions was not bad enough, the poorer classes were accustomed to confine their unfortunate kinsmen in garrets and cellars, where, loaded with chains, they were left to unspeakable torments. The sad condition of poor debtors is well known, but in view of the ample and specific evidence presented in this volume we are made to realize more clearly and vividly than before the injustice and iniquity of the system. The author's remarks on prisons in general apply with particular cogency to this class. "The eighteenth century," he says, "has many terrible sights and shows: there is nothing

more terrible, more sickening, more heartrending, than the picture of its prisons; than the thought of innocent girls and boys thrust into the whirlpool of hell which they pleasantly called a House of Correction or a House of Reformation."

The lawlessness and disorder of the period call for especial mention. Leaving out of account the highway robberies and housebreakings, a matter of common knowledge, it is estimated that £710,000 in petty thefts was disposed of each year in old rag and iron shops, of which there were 300 in 1796; and no less than £500,000 was lost annually from unloading ships in the Thames. Violence and rioting had attained the most startling dimensions, and the mob on occasions when it got the bit in its teeth careered widely on its path of destruction. A celebrated example may be found in the Gordon riots so vividly described in the pages of the present book. There was no organized system of policing, the parish officers were as a rule venal and inefficient, and the soldiers were only called in as a last resort. Sporadic private efforts to keep order, such as the mug-house associations, were able to exercise only a temporary and limited restraint. Frightful penalties covered the pages of the statute-books, to be sure — capital punishments (a list is given p. 519), transportation, and imprisonment, which in the then deplorable condition of the prisons was a form of punishment almost equally to be dreaded. Indeed the prevalence of jail-fever frequently meant ultimate death for the prisoner, and it was in fact so contagious that even judges, juries, and attendants at court were stricken down. It is often alleged that these excessive and often barbarous forms of punishment defeated their own ends. Doubtless there is much in this contention, but it is equally true and less generally understood that much of the trouble was due to the difficulty of enforcing the laws. The inadequate police system, the corrupt judges, and the fear of the desperate and dangerous classes made it frequently impossible not only to secure arrests, but also to obtain convictions. The timid citizen often preferred to leave the discovery of crimes to paid informers. All sorts of injustice are evident in the administration of the laws. For instance, one Major Bernardi and certain others were imprisoned for a supposed share in a conspiracy to murder King William and, in spite of the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679, were without trial continued in prison by four successive acts of Parliament under William III., Anne, George I., and George II. The terrible practice of *peine forte et dure* still existed, though the present account does not state that it was abolished in 1772. The ghastly revelry accompanying Tyburn processions, abolished in 1783, are graphically described from a contemporary account. Apparently there were very few state executions in this century, only five persons being executed on Tower Hill.

A few samples might be cited to illustrate the stores of miscellaneous information which the author has brought together. Much space is devoted to the condition of the London streets, which "were no cleaner; . . . were as badly lighted; . . . were as inefficiently guarded in 1744 as in 1344." There is a picturesque and animated account of the river-

side and its population. Fishing in the river was still an occupation; and, though bridges existed, boats were considerably employed for crossing. The extent of gambling and betting is proverbial; but it is perhaps not so generally known that from 1569 to 1826, first at intervals and then as an annual institution, government lotteries existed. Dueling was widely prevalent, indeed even clergymen fought, but contests were rarely fatal. There was at least one instance of wife-selling at Smithfield during the century, and the king's crower still crowed the hours on Good Friday night.

A few errors remain to be noted. Occasionally when venturing into the field of general history the author is apt to commit himself to inadequate or misleading generalizations, *e. g.* when he speaks of taxation without representation (p. 31). The Corporation Act was not repealed by George I. (p. 9). The peace of Paris is said to have been signed in 1787 (p. 33). The possible implication that Clarkson and Wilberforce were Quakers (p. 62) is obviously erroneous, though most of those associated with them in the effort to abolish the slave-trade were of that faith; the act abolishing slavery in the colonies was passed in August, 1833, not in 1834 (p. 62). Ludgate is said to mean a postern; but nothing is said to indicate that the hill got its name from the temple supposed to have been erected to Lud, the mythical British king, anciently regarded as the god of commerce (p. 99). Bishop Porteous's name is usually spelt Porteus (p. 163). The statement that the East India Company was founded in the sixteenth century is apt to convey a misleading impression, since it did not receive a charter till 1600, and was only founded the year before (p. 213). It is said (p. 532) that prisoners on criminal charges were not allowed counsel till 1820; as a matter of fact they were not allowed the full benefits of counsel till the Prisoner's Counsel Act of 1836. A statement made by Strype in 1754 is referred to (p. 538), whereas he died in 1737. In the reference to the Court of Requests (p. 566) it would have made matters clearer to state that the body under that name was abolished by Statute 16 C. II. Occasional comments (*e. g.* pp. 13, 17, 18, 20) seem rather flat for such an experienced writer. But these are all mere minor blemishes: the last word must be one of praise and gratitude for this valuable and interesting contribution.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

The Correspondence of the Colonial Governors of Rhode Island, 1723-1775. Published by the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. Edited by GERTRUDE SELWYN KIMBALL. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. 1902, 1903. Two vols., pp. lxii, 434; xxvi, 498.)

As it becomes more common to render the manuscript collections in American archives available in print, the need will be more apparent for a work which shall serve as a model in methods of detail. Without apparently in the least intending to supply such a model, the editor of

this work might well be considered as having done so. So far as the period is concerned, she has set before herself a definite date, and, after securing from all imaginable sources the unpublished correspondence belonging in that period, has supplemented it, in an appendix to the second volume, by a list of such letters of the same period as are already in print in Mr. Bartlett's *Colonial Records* of Rhode Island. Not only are paper and type most carefully and intelligently chosen, but the work is equipped with an exhaustive topical index, useful in ways quite out of the common, as will be seen from a careful reading of the explanatory note prefixed to it; an exceptionally workmanlike list of contents prefixed to each volume, in which the substance of each one of the 488 letters is skilfully and lucidly minuted; and even a "list of the terms of administration of the governors represented in this collection" appended to the editor's very scholarly introduction. Add to this the fact that judicious insight marks the not too numerous but very welcome annotations, and even the selection of the few but well-chosen portraits and other illustrations. Still more important is the fact that the reader's confidence is secured by the minute accuracy to be observed on every page, and also in the exact reproduction of the spelling and punctuation of the original, and even in the almost irreproachable proof-reading. Two exceptions only have been noted, where the type-setter's perversity was allowed to triumph. One was in printing McGrady for McCrady (II. 172), which is after all not an eighteenth-century name, but a recent one. The other is in the passage from a letter of 1733 in the introduction (I. xiii), where an eccentricity of spelling just a shade beyond the high level of eccentricity found in these letter-writers gives us the spelling "Imminitys." Even this word, when printed in its proper place, on p. 34 of the same volume, agrees properly with the original manuscript. In few particulars has the judgment of the editor been more apparent than in the rendering of the various abbreviations, contractions, and signs (such as that indicating the double letter) found in the original; and the work is disfigured by no such absurdities as "Ye," standing for the definite article. Where the reader and student have been given so much that shows an enlightened desire on the editor's part to "put yourself in his place," it is perhaps illogical to ask for more; and yet a brief key or guide to the system of rendering abbreviations, prefixed to the work, would have been a real boon, particularly as it is noticed that the character & in the original is here replaced by the word and.

It has been thought better to direct attention to the editor's methods, as above, than to the subjects treated. Exhaustiveness is one of the qualities aimed at by the editor, as above indicated; and where it is lacking, this is due to causes beyond the editor's control; as, for instance, where the reader who queries why so late a date as 1723 should stand for the beginning of the work is informed that "the official correspondence of Rhode Island for" the first sixty-four years has "completely disappeared." It is an interesting fact also that so noteworthy an episode in colonial history as the Albany Congress of 1754 scarcely figures in

these pages, except indirectly. While one of the "parties" to the correspondence was the colonial governor (represented in this correspondence by eleven Rhode Island citizens, of distinctly forceful characteristics), the other party was usually though not invariably the "colonial agent" representing the colony at London. Only two persons filled this position for Rhode Island during this interesting but turbulent half-century, namely, Richard Partridge, till his death in 1759, and afterwards Joseph Sherwood.

Perhaps not the least significant fact in connection with this very creditable instance of critical historical work is that it is undertaken by a Society of the Colonial Dames. In view of its striking excellence, it is natural to wish that it may prove an inspiration to like undertakings by branches of that society in other states; and yet it is to be hoped that any such society will refrain from undertaking the enterprise unless it is able to place the work in the hands of a trained historical student, as in this case.

WILLIAM E. FOSTER.

Historic Highways of America. By ARCHER BUTLER HULBERT. Vol. V. The Old Glade Road; Vol. VI. Boone's Wilderness Road. (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Co. 1903. Pp. 205; 207.)

FEW writers in summing up the decentralizing tendencies among the American colonists have omitted from the category the effects of commercial competition. Evidence may be collected here and there of the strife between various neighboring seaports to secure the inland trade. The long-continued rivalry between Baltimore and Philadelphia had a larger counterpart in the struggle between the two provinces of Virginia and Pennsylvania to secure the trade which naturally accumulated about the head waters of the Ohio. The advantage which would have accrued to Virginia from the cutting of Braddock's road as a complement to the Potomac was destroyed by the disastrous termination of that expedition. But she would undoubtedly bend every energy to have the same route followed when another attempt should be made to dislodge the French from the Ohio. How Pennsylvania stepped in at a late hour, and through pressure brought to bear upon the generals in command carried the day against Virginia influence and even against Colonel Washington constitutes the main impression left upon the reader by the fifth volume of Mr. Hulbert's series on historic highways.

The Old Glade road, commonly known as the Forbes or Bouquet route, has always had a place on the maps of the eastern states, but has been overshadowed by its southern parallel, the Cumberland or National Turnpike, which follows Braddock's road. From Lancaster, Pennsylvania, the Old Glade road passed through Carlisle, Bedford, and Ligonier to Pittsburg. In the latter city its memory is perpetuated by Forbes Avenue, one of the principal thoroughfares. It was supplemented at its eastern terminus by the Philadelphia and Lancaster highway. Its construction was due entirely to the determination of Forbes and Bouquet,

the successors of Braddock in attempting to penetrate the west, to cut a new way across the highlands of Pennsylvania rather than to make the detour to the southward necessary to follow the old way along the river-bottoms. The author shows how the province of Pennsylvania, unwilling to coöperate with Virginia in making the Braddock expedition, was suddenly aroused to great activity by the incursions of the Indians on her border after the defeat. She constructed a chain of forts along the eastern base of the mountains and hurried militia to them. These and other activities were largely responsible for the decision of Forbes and Bouquet to cut a new road through the state. Neither Forbes, who was a Scotchman, nor Bouquet, who was a Swiss, had any local interests to serve in choosing a route. Each was disgusted with the bickering between Pennsylvania and Virginia. "The majority of these gentlemen do not know the difference between a party and an army," wrote Forbes to Bouquet. So clearly has the author brought out this intercolonial dissension over such a simple matter as the construction of a highway that the case will merit a mention hereafter in any study of the subject.

The material for the volume is taken almost entirely from the official correspondence of Forbes and Bouquet, together with that of Sir John St. Clair, as preserved in the British Museum and in the British Public Record Office. Forbes was in command of the expedition, but was delayed by illness, throwing the burden upon Bouquet. St. Clair was the quartermaster-general, the duties of whose office brought him face to face with the problem of road-making. The author does not exaggerate in saying that a highway through the woods was with Forbes as with Braddock the final test of the enterprise. Fort Duquesne could be captured with half the force if troops and supplies could be transported across the mountains. The immense labor involved in constructing the road may be gathered incidentally by extracts from the correspondence. From one point, it would require five hundred men five days to cut to the top of the mountain. "Send as many men as you can with digging tools, this is a most diabolical work, and whiskey must be had." Six hundred men cut the way over Laurel Hill in three days. Forbes declared that the slow advance of the new road and the cause of it "touched him to the quick." The rains of autumn found the army too far from Duquesne to reach that point without wintering on the way. The expedition was saved, and the judgment of Forbes and Bouquet in choosing that way was upheld only by Bradstreet's destroying at Fort Frontenac the stores intended for Fort Duquesne. The evacuation of the latter saved the day. Pennsylvania now had the first continued highway to the Ohio, which she soon converted into the Pennsylvania Road, and later into the Chambersburg and Pittsburg Turnpike. The author demonstrates what few realize, that the Cumberland National Road owes its prestige to its national paternity, and that the Pennsylvania Road was patronized almost exclusively by the migrants who came from the New England states to people the region north of the Ohio.

Boone's Wilderness Road, which forms the subject of the sixth volume, was the result of the first trans-Alleghanian expansion, the migration of the country people of Virginia and North Carolina to the valleys of Kentucky and Tennessee. As in the preceding volumes, a map of the road is wanting. This would seem to be a prime requisite in planning the work. Strictly speaking, the road was formed on the head waters of the Tennessee River in what is now the extreme southwestern corner of the state of Virginia. It was fed by roads down the Shenandoah Valley, and up the James River in Virginia, and up the Yadkin and down the New River in North Carolina. It collected all these into one great highway by passing through the narrow Cumberland Gap where the boundary lines of Virginia, North Carolina, and Kentucky now meet. Thence the way was clear to the blue-grass region and on to the Falls of the Ohio, now Louisville. The route had been traversed by Boone as early as 1771 and was blazed and cleared by a party under his leadership in 1775. It was made into a wagon road at a later time by the state of Kentucky, but owing to the rivalry of the Ohio River as a route to the west travel over it never assumed any magnitude.

The difficult task of extending a single subject over such a long series, compelling the introduction of much extraneous matter to atone for the lack of pertinent material, is painfully manifest in this volume. The latter portion is taken up with a readable sketch of Western history during the Revolution, including the campaigns of Clark, Bird, and others but very slightly connected with the Wilderness Road. The first chapter of the book, entitled "The Pilgrims of the West," is admissible only as a description of the frontiersmen who demanded and constructed the road. A chronological perspective is not maintained at all times. Henderson's Transylvania Company is introduced on page 42 and again on page 88, many details being repeated. The marking of the road by Boone and the founding of Boonesborough are given in two distinct places in the book, with Walker's exploration, Gist's mission, and Dunmore's war between.

One takes up this volume with the feeling that the author has left the realm of fancy which characterized the first two numbers in the series, and the military details which occupied the two succeeding ones, and has now entered upon the real history of the movement of the people; for the Wilderness Road is essentially a popular highway. But the author confesses that he has little to give in the way of local information. "The writer has sought with some care to know more of these," he says, "of the modes of travel, the entertainment which was afforded along the road to men and beasts, and the several social relations of the greater settlements in Virginia and Kentucky to this thin line of human lives across the continent. Very little information has been secured." Is this disappointing conclusion due to the non-existence of such material? Would a systematic and prolonged search have produced more satisfactory results? Evidently only two sources were drawn upon — the Filson Club of Louisville, Kentucky, and the Wisconsin Historical Society. A few

manuscript letters from the latter storehouse appear, but the mass of material has been printed, and is available in any library even to the casual reader. The Wilderness Road coincided in its upper parts with the road leading to the settlements on the upper Tennessee. Might not a search of documents at Knoxville and Nashville supply such additional information as would make a real contribution to knowledge without detracting from the novelty and attractiveness which thus far characterize the series?

EDWIN ERLE SPARKS.

A History of the British Army. By THE HONORABLE J. W. FORTESCUE. Second Part—from the close of the Seven Years' War to the second Peace of Paris. Vol. III., 1763-1793. (London: Macmillan and Company, Limited; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1902. Pp. xxviii, 621.)

THIS volume, carrying the history of the British army through the period of the American Revolution, might be very useful to the student of that war, were it not for its spirit of unfairness toward the American cause, which is shown at every opportunity. That the story of the Revolution can be written from the point of view of an English Tory without outraging the sympathies of a fair-minded American has been signally demonstrated by Lecky, while Trevelyan satisfies the unreasoning patriotism of the veriest Jingo. In this book we have an English historian writing in the spirit of Lord George Germain or poor old pensioned Dr. Johnson.

In the period between the close of the French and Indian War and the opening of the Revolution, he is more aware of the agitation than of its causes. It "is always a dangerous period," he writes suggestively, "when politicians and agitators, who have been long thrust to the wall by generals and admirals, return again to their places with louder voices and enhanced importance." Again and again the author puts emphasis upon the agitation, while ignoring or belittling the causes of it. A few quotations will best give the flavor of the book. It is the malicious spirit of the narrator which offends, rather than the fact, as in the following sentence: "The mob of Boston had long ago learned to meet any unpopular measure with lawless violence, and their Congregational ministers to search the Scriptures for their encouragement." Of the "Boston Massacre" he says, "The blame for the bloodshed rests wholly with the magistrates of Boston . . ." Of the trial he writes with a sneer, "this . . . was always paraded as a specimen of the impartiality of American justice." On the influence of local government he comments, "The machinery of municipal administration permitted the assembling of mobs under the name of town-meetings, whenever the agitators might require them."

The intolerant tone often makes even truth offensive, as in the following passage: "A stream of trash about chains and slavery, hirelings of oppression, brutal instruments of tyranny . . . flowed inexhaustibly from the tongues of orators and the pens of pamphleteers." Again, an

uncharitable interpretation of patriot utterances is due to an entire misunderstanding of actual conditions. One must know very little of the slow growth of the desire for independence who could write: "The state papers and remonstrances, many of them very ably drafted, with their pretence of humility and submission, their grave and ceremonious insolence, and their frequent shameless perversion of facts . . . the unblushing partiality of juries . . . all these things by long tradition came quite naturally to the people of Boston."

Mr. Fortescue is quite as perverse in dealing with the first Continental Congress. He does not even grant them honesty, but says, "It was a curious body, and to judge from its first action, not a very straightforward one." After reviewing their papers, he writes, "These productions, though on the face of the matter not admirable even as specimens of lying, are remarkable as indications of the early hunger of the Americans after Canada."

In the treatment of the war itself, the campaigns, battles, and engagements, the author is more even-handed, but he is ever ready to accept the most absurd newspaper canards derogatory to American humanity. He tells, for example, the old story about the Americans' scalping some of the dead and wounded British soldiers at Concord bridge. The author's comments and criticisms upon the campaigns are often very enlightening and suggestive. Montgomery and Arnold's attack on Quebec he regards as a foolish enterprise, "for even if the Americans had taken Quebec they could not have held it without an adequate naval force." The condition of the British army is examined critically and ably, and the reasons for its inefficiency are more clearly shown than in any previous work known to the reviewer. The plans of the British ministry are severely criticized. "The mere fact that . . . [they rested their] hopes on the co-operation of the American loyalists was sufficient to distract its councils and to vitiate its plans. Their purpose being vague and undefined, the ministers proceeded without any idea of what an army could or could not do, or of the force that was required for any given object."

Besides the whole course of the American war, the work of the British army in India and at Gibraltar is narrated from 1761 to 1792. The two preceding volumes, which appeared in 1899, constitute together with this volume a connected story of the growth of English military institutions and of the development of tactics in a continuous series of wars. The first 208 pages of Volume I. give a good preliminary sketch up to the establishment of the "New Model." From that point he goes into detail, devoting nearly 400 pages to Cromwell, Charles II., William, and Marlborough. The second volume covers the history of about fifty years to the treaty of Paris.

The volumes are in the main based upon the work of previous writers, usually specialists on limited fields. There is a good sense of proportion shown throughout, the style is clear, and the descriptions of battles and campaigns easy to follow.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

Les Débuts de la Révolution, dans les Départements du Cher et de l'Indre (1789-1791). Par MARCEL BRUNEAU, Agrégé d'Histoire et de Géographie, Docteur ès Lettres, Inspecteur d'Académie. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1902. Pp. 470.)

LOCAL histories of the Revolution are often particularly refreshing because they take one out of the atmosphere of the great assemblies at Paris and show exactly how each reform in the social or political constitution of France was effected and just how far promise became performance. M. Bruneau has rendered his work more than usually serviceable by crowding his pages with detailed statements of fact, explaining the form each general phase of the early Revolution took in Berry. He has drawn his material from local assembly records, administrative correspondence, official documents of all kinds. In short, this is the sort of work upon which the general historian of the Revolution may rely in studying the consequences of the reforms undertaken by the Constituent Assembly.

Berry was a province which had the happy experience of successful reform before the Revolution. It was one of the experimentations for the project of provincial assemblies devised by Turgot and later carried out by Necker. This experience undoubtedly had something to do with the fact that at the beginning it escaped the worst excesses like the war on the *châteaux*. M. Bruneau shows, however, that the royal government collapsed here as completely as in other parts of France. Unfortunately the new administrations that finally took its place did not have the resolution to enforce all the laws or to stamp out disorder. In many instances they did not act harmoniously, and proved much more expensive than the old administration.

The municipal officers were not displaced at first, as were those of Paris. The *comités permanents*, formed in imitation of the earliest improvised government of Paris, merely coöperated with the existing municipalities until the new local government law went into effect. It is curious to note that the name *permanent*, which some Parisians took to mean *non-renewable* instead of *continuously in session*, gave no similar offense in Berry. Consequently these committees were not, like the Paris committee, accused of manifesting an aristocratic tendency, and obliged to change their names and soon afterward to retire.

M. Bruneau's description of the method by which Berry was divided into the two departments of Cher and Indre shows how ill-founded is the common assertion that the work of subdividing France ignored the historical divisions of the country and was controlled largely by considerations of symmetry or of mere local topography. He disturbs another equally stubborn commonplace, which states that the sale of public lands created by the confiscation of church property increased the relative amount of small peasant properties. His results are, therefore, in substantial agreement with those of M. Lecarpentier for the district of Caudebec and M. Minzès for the Seine-et-Marne. The chief purchasers

were members of the *bourgeoisie*, although there were several nobles, especially from the *noblesse de robe*. There was also apparently much buying for speculative purposes, and even some buying by municipal officers, moved by a sense of duty to show that they did not fear a reaction which might enable the Church to recover its lands.

M. Bruneau gives interesting details about the monetary crisis, explaining how difficult it was even after the heavy issues of assignats to obtain enough of them to carry on the ordinary local business. The merchants had no other resource than to issue notes of their own, called *billets de confiance*, which answered the purpose for a time, although later they aggravated the general evil.

These examples may serve to indicate the many-sided illustrative value of the book, which carries the history of Berry down to the adoption of the constitution of 1791. It should be added that although a sympathetic student of the Revolution, M. Bruneau is not an apologist of disorder or of the petty tyrannies that were sometimes practised in the interest of the new liberties of the people.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

Financial History of the United States. By DAVIS RICH DEWEY, Ph.D., Professor of Economics and Statistics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. [American Citizen Series.] (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1903. Pp. xxxvii, 530.)

PROFESSOR DEWEY's financial history of the United States is the first attempt to sum up the results of the investigations of American historians and economists in the evolution of the money, banks, taxation, and public debts of this country. Scholars were early attracted to this rich field. The resulting literature has been an important contribution to the science of finance, quite on a par with similar work in other countries. Our varied and striking experience with paper and bank currency has been exhaustively treated by such writers as Gouge, Phillips, Bronson, Sumner, McCulloch, Horace White, and Bullock; our equally instructive experience with different forms of taxation, by Wells, Bolles, and Taussig; the fiscal problems peculiar to our history and government, by Noyes, Scott, Bourne, H. C. Adams, and Kinley; and the polemical literature of recent years on the great money and tariff questions has filled our libraries with much valuable material.

The writer of a financial history of the country cannot complain of a paucity of material. The difficulty he meets is rather one of orderly consecutiveness of the story. Professor Dewey has been signally successful in meeting this difficulty. His book avoids needless repetition, and presents the kaleidoscopic items that go to make up the country's financial history with a proper regard to their relative importance and to the thread, often slender and obscure, that binds them together. In one particular, however, we must express our regret that the author's desire to keep his book within certain bounds has led him to omit all reference

to the history of the South during the Civil War. The reviewer's interest in the history of the Confederate States may be thought to lead him to exaggerate its importance; but the history of American war finances, and especially of American paper-money régimes, would seem incomplete without a reference, even cursory, to the financial experiences of the South during the war, which ran parallel with those of the North during the same years and with those of colonial and Revolutionary times, and which would have furnished the author with striking examples of the typical financial problems and difficulties in our history.

Aside from this omission, every important topic that falls within the scope of the financial history of the United States is covered. The complicated story of the Northern finances during and after the Civil War is treated with particular success. Throughout the book the statistical material, which in less skillful hands might have become cumbersome and obscure, is arranged, abbreviated, and commented upon in a way that could not be improved upon. The analysis of Congressional votes on important bills, by geographical sections, has never, we believe, been carried so far.

The great controversies that have enlivened our financial history, such as the various bank and money questions, are summarized in a fair and dispassionate way. In this impartial treatment some may miss a fuller statement of and a more positive position on such fundamental questions as the necessity of the Legal-Tender Act of 1862 and the constitutionality of the legal-tender notes. A fuller discussion of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution and its bearing upon the fiscal policy of the individual states would have been desired.

A few inaccuracies call for comment. On page 446 it is said, "clearing-house loan certificates were once more resorted to, this time on a much larger scale than ever before." While the amount issued for instance in New York in 1893 greatly exceeded that issued on former occasions, the "scale" to be used cannot fairly be an absolute one, but the figure should be referred to the amount of deposits or to some similar index of the extent of business during the particular crisis. The thirty-eight millions of loan certificates issued in New York in 1893, by this method of calculation, represented a much smaller issue than the twenty-two millions of 1873. On the last line of page 326 it is stated that the national bank-notes "were payable by the government for its indebtedness and for interest on its bonds." The word "and" should read "except," as will be seen from a perusal of section 20 of the Bank Act of 1863 and section 23 of the act of the following year. By this slip in the text the laws are made to sanction the payment of the interest on the United States bonds in the notes of the national banks, which was of course never contemplated.

The general and topical bibliographies will be found of the greatest value, especially to students, for whom the book was presumably prepared. It will doubtless be found to be an indispensable text-book, covering as no other book does one great section of the economic history of the United States.

J. C. SCHWAB.

The American Republic and its Government. By JAMES ALBERT WOODBURN. (New York and London : G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1903. Pp. v, 410.)

Political Parties and Party Problems in the United States. By JAMES ALBERT WOODBURN. (New York and London : G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1903. Pp. ix, 314.)

The American Republic and its Government is designed as a text-book in American government for elementary college work and for advanced secondary school courses. It aims to occupy a half-way ground between the school text-book and Bryce's *American Commonwealth*. The author has succeeded admirably well in attaining his end. About one-fourth of the volume is devoted to a discussion of the principles of political science as developed and applied by the founders of the nation and the framers of the Constitution. Chapters on "The Presidency," "The Senate," "The House of Representatives," and "The Judiciary" comprise the body of the book ; a short chapter suffices for "The States and their Government" ; while the last chapter, on "The Territories and their Government," after describing the regular form of territorial government, gives a good deal of space to a discussion of the constitutional position of our recently acquired insular possessions.

Professor Woodburn's book has many excellent pedagogical features. It is sane, temperate, and well-proportioned. The exposition of principles and the statement of facts are clear and direct, and in most respects the several subjects are adequately discussed for the purpose of the book. Commendable skill is shown in presenting the important and in avoiding mention of less important or inconsequential details. The author is careful to treat both sides of controversial topics with fairness, and in general the work shows that the writer understands his subject and, what is more, has taught it and has learned from experience where emphasis should be laid. Hence he has produced a thoroughly teachable book. No attempt is made to advance unusual or novel views, and by such self-restraint the value of the work as a text-book is materially increased.

Praiseworthy emphasis is laid in several instances upon facts which have been perverted by known but often repeated error, as on page 202, where it is clearly shown that the compromise in the Convention of 1787 over the basis of representation was not the cause of the adoption of the bicameral system, since that form of legislative assembly was determined upon before the dispute over the basis of representation arose. The position is taken that all attempts to bind the future sovereign will by restrictive clauses in a constitution, such as that giving equal suffrage in the Senate to the states, are futile, and that the clause mentioned can be changed constitutionally by ordinary process of amendment.

Accuracy is the general rule, although several incorrect statements appear. On page 117 the assertion is made that the Constitution requires that the day for choosing presidential electors must be the same throughout the United States — an error that a more careful reading of the Con-

stitution would have prevented. The act of 1845, not the Constitution, requires the election to occur everywhere on the same day. On page 322 the classes of controversies in which jurisdiction is given by the Constitution to the Federal courts are enumerated, and it is stated that the Eleventh Amendment has withdrawn from that jurisdiction controversies between a state and citizens of another state; this of course is not true of suits brought by a state against a citizen of another state. While too much explanation defeats the ends of an elementary text-book, it would seem that the limitation of the force of the Eleventh Amendment by the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Cohens vs. Virginia* should have been mentioned. The same criticism, similarly modified, would suggest that the limitation placed upon the power of suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by the Supreme Court in the *Milligan* case should have been noted. Certainly the intervention in Louisiana of the Federal government under Grant should not have been omitted in a somewhat lengthy discussion of the guarantee clause of the Constitution. The author takes too much for granted in assuming, as he does in three places, that the Danish West Indies are already possessions of the United States, although he states in a foot-note that the treaty had not as yet been ratified by Denmark. President Cleveland's articles on "Executive Independence" are quoted (p. 189) in one instance as in the *Atlantic Monthly* for 1901, and later on the same page as in the same magazine for 1900; but such typographical errors are unusually rare.

Political Parties and Party Problems in the United States is a companion volume to the one just reviewed. The book gives much valuable information in a well-arranged and useful form. The facts are well considered and accurately stated; and yet a comparison of the two volumes compels the conclusion that the author is on surer ground in *The American Republic*. It is handled with a firmer grasp, with a better sense of proportion, and with greater breadth and skill of treatment than the second book.

The first half of the volume is devoted to an historical sketch of American political parties. Part II., comprising about one-fourth of the book, describes the machinery and practical operation of American party organizations. The last quarter, Part III., is given to a discussion of the ethical problems in party politics.

Professor Woodburn avoids controversial ground as much as possible, and gives, in general, a mere outline of the development of parties and party principles. At times, however, he does not hesitate to take sides positively on disputed points. On page 62 he defends the action of the Liberty party in voting for Birney in 1844, even though it may have caused the defeat of Clay and the triumph of the party pledged to annexation. He states that the majority of the American people desired annexation, and that Whig victory, even though won by antislavery votes, would not have prevented such a consummation. The author opposes the view prevalent in recent years, that the fundamental principle of the Whig party was Congressional domination, or legislative control of the

several departments of government. Again, he shows conclusively that the capture of the Democratic national convention in 1896 by the radical and silver wing of the party was due to deep-seated causes that had been long operative, and not to convention oratory, as has been popularly supposed. Occasionally the political philosophy at the basis of party action is ably and clearly demonstrated, as in the explanation of the "unit rule" in the Democratic national convention.

Proportion is not well observed in the historical treatment of political parties. Forty-four pages are given to the history of the several antislavery parties, while thirty-seven pages suffice for the history of parties under the Constitution down to the fall of the Whigs. In this latter part very little space is devoted to the Jacksonian Democracy; and in fact from the division of the old Republican party to the close of the Reconstruction period the Democratic party is given scant notice. On page 90, in an enumeration of the parties and a description of the platforms of 1860, no mention is made of the Bell-Everett party. On page 79 the proof-reader has allowed the Compromise of 1850 to appear as that of 1856; and on page 82 the expression "Northwest Territory" is used to designate the trans-Mississippi territory north of 36° 30'.

The author's chapter on "Party Morality" is excellent and timely, and the discussion of ethical problems in Part III. is sound and judicious, though perhaps contributing little to the vital literature of the subject.

Useful topical bibliographies, short but well selected, occur at the end of most of the chapters. One wonders why such a list of references is omitted from the chapter on "States and their Government" in *The American Republic*, and why Part I. of the second volume should likewise be slighted. In both books frequent and often long extracts from well-known authorities are incorporated in the text itself, to such an extent that the impression of lack of originality which the volumes as a whole convey is considerably strengthened.

These books are written for the young student and the general reader, and not for the scholar and specialist. The author does not present his work as the result of exhaustive original research; he does however show excellent judgment in arranging and skill in setting forth the facts, which are derived in most cases from secondary sources. The style, although not brilliant, is well adapted to his purpose, and the proof-reading is carefully done. The books are on the whole creditable to their author, and will prove, *The American Republic* especially, useful additions to the literature of American government and politics.

MARSHALL S. BROWN.

The Life of James Madison. By GAILLARD HUNT. (New York: Doubleday, Page, and Company. 1902. Pp. viii, 402.)

If the title of Mr. Hunt's solid and well-digested work were to read "The Times of James Madison," it would more accurately represent the contents, for the author throughout relegates Madison's personality to the background and follows the course of general political history. The

first chapter opens with a full account of the formation of the first Virginia constitution, which occupies twelve pages, although Madison only once took part in the proceedings, and then ineffectually. Then follow two brief chapters on Madison's education and early life, after which comes a study of Virginia government and legislation during the Confederation period, and a survey of the steps leading to the calling of the Federal Convention, the process of constitution-making, and the struggle for ratification. After that the narrative follows the current of general history, varying from chronological order occasionally in order to compare Madison's later opinions on nullification with his views at the time of the Virginia Resolutions or to group related diplomatic dealings. Generally speaking, the earlier period receives far more minute attention than the later, the record of Madison's term as secretary of state being strikingly condensed. The book is really a temperately and independently written history of the United States from 1776 to 1817 with occasional references to James Madison.

No doubt this method of treatment results to a large extent from the humdrum correctness and dryness of Madison's personality and from that complete absorption in public affairs which led him to discuss paper money when he should have been courting, and which renders his collected works at once so valuable and so colorless. But the author goes farther than is necessary in his adherence to the general and impersonal, for he passes over with slight mention and usually without discussion nearly everything human in Madison's career. The private relations of Madison with his Virginia contemporaries — Henry, Marshall, and Edmund Randolph — scarcely appear; the whole episode of John Randolph's frantic attack upon him is dismissed in a few lines; and Monroe's quarrel receives less than a page. It is not made clear just how Madison was regarded in his first term by the Young Republicans, and, still stranger, there is no mention except in one brief paragraph of the personal opposition of the New York Clintonians. But perhaps the most striking omission is that of any discussion of the relations of Jefferson with Madison and of any full estimate of the extent to which the latter was swayed in his political career after 1789 by the older man. We are nowhere told, for example, how independent a part was played by Madison as secretary of state. The only episode in his eight years of service that is fully treated is the Louisiana purchase, and this is described with almost no mention of Jefferson. In this respect the book does not furnish the information one ordinarily looks for in the biography of a statesman. What Mr. Hunt has done is well done, but it is not new; what he has failed to do is suggested by Mr. Henry Adams's treatment of Madison in his history, which still remains the most lifelike presentation of the man.

Mr. Hunt's method has the conspicuous merit of breadth and true perspective, and his attitude toward his hero is noticeably well-balanced and judicious. Nowhere is Madison given the credit of unusual influence or success without contemporary testimony in text or foot-note to support the assertion, nor is any criticism ventured without a display of the

evidence. The fairness of the author's position may be illustrated by his comments on Madison's abandonment of the Federalists in 1790:

If base motives of expediency must be attributed to him because he declined to follow Hamilton's lead . . . the same odium must be visited upon all the former Federalists in the South who were now the preponderating force in the Anti-Federal party. . . . At the present day it is possible for a man who is a member of the Democratic party to be esteemed, even by those who do not agree with him, as an honest patriot, and no violent mental effort should be necessary to attribute political integrity and patriotic motives to the leaders who founded the Democratic party more than a century ago. . . . In the heat of political conflict men say and even believe things of their opponents which at calmer times they would not sanction. This must be remembered in extenuation of Madison's attitude toward Hamilton. It is a merciful interpretation which ought to be accepted by the partisans of Hamilton in exchange for like charity extended to their own hero, who also sadly needs it.

But of Madison as a war leader Mr. Hunt says candidly: "In truth he was not an inspiring figure to lead in war. The hour had come but the man was wanting. Not a scholar in governments ancient and modern, not an unimpassioned writer of careful messages but a robust leader to rally the people and unite them to fight was what the time needed and what it did not find in Madison." It should be said, however, that Hamilton and the New England Federalists are viewed by Mr. Hunt through distinctly Madisonian spectacles, and there is one figure who certainly receives less than what most people would consider his due. From his first appearance to his last Patrick Henry seldom is mentioned without a depreciatory phrase, and the worst accusations of his political opponents are quoted with apparent approval. Mr. Hunt seems to have ignored Mr. Tyler's rehabilitation of the eloquent Virginian and to have adopted in full Jefferson's well-known attitude.

In style the book is clear and vigorous, now and then lighted up by touches of sarcasm or by a downright epithet. Yet the dryness of Madison's personality appears at times to place on the writer's spirits a damper of which he seems not wholly unconscious. In view of this fact the title of "three musqueteers" applied several times by Mr. Hunt to the trio of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe grows more absurd with each repetition. Three men to whom, taken together, the title of Dumas's heroes is less applicable could scarcely be imagined.

It is almost needless to say that the historical workmanship of the volume is as sound and scholarly as would be expected from the editor of Madison's works. The copious foot-notes prove the text to be based on a wide knowledge of everything that has been printed concerning Madison, together with a great deal of unpublished material in the archives of the State Department and elsewhere. The book has a respectable although by no means exhaustive index. There are, however, a few minor matters where exception may be taken on the point of style. The habitual wording of references to unpublished material is simply "Dept. of State MS." Now, when the date and author of a letter thus referred to are named in

the text it may not be necessary to describe the document in the note, but when, as happens occasionally, either or both of these is lacking, the reference becomes hopelessly blind. There are also a few vague footnotes where we are referred simply to "Journal of the House of Delegates" (p. 78 ff.); to "Bancroft VIII" (p. 123); to "Yates" (p. 135); and to "Ford's *Essays on the Constitution*" (p. 142). A few misprints have been observed, nearly all of a minor character, except on page 297, where we are told that Napoleon boasted of receiving for Louisiana sixty million "livers." Generally speaking, the volume is as creditable in appearance as it is sound in its contents, and it forms a worthy opening number for the biographical series of which it is a part.

THEODORE CLARKE SMITH.

Nelson and his Captains: Sketches of Famous Seamen. By W. H. FITCHETT. (London: Smith, Elder, and Company. 1902. Pp. 322.)

THIS is a very useful, entertaining, and creditable little volume. It is not and is not intended to be an original or exhaustive work of research either in biography or in naval history, but gives just what the title-page promises — a series of sketches. They are thoughtfully and enthusiastically written in a simple yet pleasing, vivacious style. They stimulate interest or refresh the memory concerning the strategy and tactics of the greatest epoch in naval history, and present in convenient form the life and character of great sailors who won safety and glory for England and made great advances in the science of warfare on the sea.

Though Nelson is the ostensible subject of but one of the chapters, he is the inspiration of the whole book. Indeed the second chapter has for its title "The Men of Nelson's School", and though each of the remaining chapters bears the name of one of the great sailors of this school, it is largely in relation to Nelson that their careers are described.

The chapter on Nelson is not a biography, but a "character study" done with great insight and literary skill, with impartiality and yet with perfect sympathy. The author emphasizes with admirable candor the weakness as well as the nobility of his high-strung, moody character, the possible flaws as well as the overwhelming dazzling supremacy of his naval genius. We get a vivid picture of the "fragile, undersized, half-womanly figure", who was yet "the greatest sea-warrior the world has ever seen" and "almost, if not quite, the most terrible fighter, whether on sea or land, war has known", for whom "to be in the passion and perils of a great battle" was, in his own words, to be "in the full tide of happiness." In a few luminous sentences the author gives an appreciation of Nelson's strategy and tactics, of his debts to his predecessors and his superiority to them. We see his discipline, his care for the health of his men, his perfect efficiency even in mere practical seamanship, his burning sense of duty with all its limitations and narrowness, his loyalty to his subordinates, and his power of arousing their devotion; for "the noble law that trust creates loyalty, and love kindles love, fulfilled itself

in Nelson's career." The author appropriately closes his sketch by making an interesting comparison of Nelson with his great contemporaries, Wellington and Napoleon.

The chapter on the men of Nelson's school gives a vivacious account of the rough yet efficacious practical apprenticeship of the lads who became Nelson's captains, contrasts in effective manner the achievements of the navy with the — to modern eyes — tiny ships of the time, gives instances of the well-nigh incredible courage bred in officers and men by the old system or lack of system, and, as typical elements in the character of Nelson's captains, suggests hate of Frenchmen, love of adventure and of a fat prize, "pride of race, pride in the flag, loyalty to king and country, the impulse of discipline, the dread of dishonour, the sense of comradeship with gallant men and of partnership in great deeds." To these forces the author emphatically adds the personal influence and training of Nelson. "The infection of his lofty and eager spirit caught lower natures and hurried them beyond themselves." His "praise was for them fame; his disapproval was more bitter than defeat, and more to be dreaded than death."

Then follow the interesting sketches of the individual captains. First Berry, who was no tactician, but an unsurpassed fighting subordinate. The next portrait is that of the "gallant and good Riou," as Nelson called him, the hero of "well-nigh the most heroic feat of seamanship on record." This feat was of course the famous affair of the wrecked *Guardian*, which Riou with a handful of men kept afloat and triumphantly brought into Table Bay after nine weeks of almost incredible endurance, skill, and courage — qualities which we meet again in the tragic close of his career at Copenhagen, where, in Nelson's words, the shot that cut Riou in two inflicted upon the British navy an "irreparable loss." Riou's own dying words, "What will Nelson think of us?", strikingly exemplify the feeling of the "school" for the master.

Then Blackwood, the hero of the famous fight between his frigate of 36 guns and the *Guillaume Tell*, an incident "difficult to parallel in sea warfare," Blackwood, the "prince of frigate captains," who twice refused the command of a 74 for mere joy in frigate service. The chapter on Blackwood is particularly pleasing as illustrating the author's readiness to recognize heroism in French officers, as indeed Blackwood himself became a lifelong friend of the gallant commander of the *Guillaume Tell*. Apart from his important services in the preliminaries and in the actual battle of Trafalgar, he is immortalized in Nelson's "God bless you, Blackwood, I shall never see you more."

Troubridge of course finds, as he deserves, an enthusiastic chapter, Troubridge, of whom Nelson said, "he is, as a friend and an officer, a nonpareil." Next to Nelson, says Dr. Fitchett, "scarcely any other sailor in that age of great seamen gives so vividly the sense of capacity for great things." "Look at Troubridge," cried the usually grim, undemonstrative Jervis at St. Vincent. "He takes his ship to battle as though the eyes of all England were upon him; and would to God they were!"

The tragedy of the *Culloden* helplessly aground at the battle of the Nile is relieved by Nelson's noble and successful insistence, "for heaven's sake, for my sake," that Troubridge should be equally honored with his other captains. But those black, maddening hours on the shoals were not the only tragedy of Troubridge's career; and it is with feelings of deep sadness that we read of his breach with Nelson and finally of the cyclone in which he and his ship went down together.

We get graphic pictures of the splendid exploits of the gigantic, dauntless Hallowell; a good portrait of Ball, the philosopher-sailor, Nelson's great friend, distinguished at the Nile and hero of the siege of Malta; and one of the gallant opponent of Linois, Saumarez, whom, it is unpleasant to remember, Nelson unjustly disliked in spite of his great daring and superb seamanship. Sketches are also given of Parker, of Pellew (Lord Exmouth), of Foley, and lastly of Hardy, who was "imperishably linked to the memory of Nelson by the pathos of the immortal scene in the cockpit of the *Victory*, and by the half-womanly tenderness" of Nelson's dying words, in which "Hardy's name is enshrined for all time." With him, who beyond all others was the "comrade Nelson would have chosen to hold his hand as he died," and in whose coffin Nelson's portrait lies, the interesting and inspiring volume closes.

W. F. TILTON.

The Story of General Bacon. BY ALNOD J. BOGER. (London: Methuen and Company. 1903. Pp. xii, 308.)

IN our American generation of Civil War veterans, all of whom have experienced the daily toils and pleasures of campaigning, there has always been an audience for the personal narrative of a soldier; since the Boer War this class in Great Britain has multiplied. The technical military history commands fewer readers. Human sympathy goes out towards the individual, not the army corps. It is a long hark back to Waterloo, and yet the story of one who there bore arms loses not interest. A direct descendant of Anthony (brother of Francis Lord Bacon) and son of one of the richest commoners in England; the youngster who even at Eton refused to take a birching at the hands of the famous flogger Keats, because a commission in the Sixteenth Light Dragoons had been provided for him before he left school, and he was already entitled to wear the king's uniform; the youngster whose father never gave him a regular allowance, but paid his debts from time to time, was apt to grow up wayward. And this in a way Bacon was; but he appears to have learned to ride and fence and speak the truth — a mighty good education, properly construed, to-day.

Joining his regiment in Spain in 1813 young Bacon, then seventeen years old, found himself among a lot of veterans of twenty-two and three who had been in the field for four years; but, like most cavalry officers, he saw more of hardy but innocuous outpost duty and less of hard fighting than he would have seen in the foot, on whom falls four-fifths of the desperate work of the assault or the battle. He had, from an adjoining hill, "a

complete bird's-eye view of the first battle of Sorauren," one that does not often fall to the lot of a subaltern; and he was an interested spectator at the siege of San Sebastian, while Graham's men lay on their faces at the foot of the rampart into which the batteries were pouring shot within a few feet of their backs to make a breach big enough for them to mount it over a *chevaux-de-frise* of sword-blades. No wonder when he saw it afterwards he deemed "the great breach a ghastly spectacle of slaughter." With his regiment Bacon served until the end of the war in 1814. In love with the life, he then hoped to be ordered to America, but the Sixteenth was not chosen. It was, however, not long after its return to England before Napoleon's return from Elba sent all available troops over to Belgium, and from a half-pay lieutenant Bacon again found himself on active duty as lieutenant of the Tenth Hussars. The Waterloo campaign is fairly described, and a generous word for Blücher and the French is thrown in. Indeed, there is no disparagement of the enemy in these pages. They are given their due meed of praise, while the British soldier's good qualities are magnified, and sometimes his ill ones are not forgotten. It is the instinct of that greatest of virtues, patriotism, that exalts our own soldier beyond any other.

Before Waterloo, Bacon's regiment was with the party that traced Blücher's direction after Ligny, so as to enable Wellington to take corresponding action. At the battle his regiment was one of those that did not get put in until the end, the men and officers fretting their ardent souls away within gunshot of their brothers locked in mortal struggle with the foe. But when their time came, they had their full share. Bacon, struck in two places in the charge, with eight other officers and forty-five men killed and wounded of the Tenth, lay unconscious on the field, was robbed by night-hawks, and next morning was picked up and nursed back to life. One of the bullets he carried, near his knee, the rest of his life.

Midway in the seventeen succeeding years of peace, Bacon married Lady Charlotte Harley, the beautiful girl to whom Byron dedicated his *Childe Harold*. He served in various places, including Madras and Gibraltar. His father did not leave him rich. In 1825 we find him major of the Seventeenth Lancers; in 1832, in the Civil War in Portugal, Colonel Bacon formed a regiment of lancers to go again to the Peninsula. Nearly half the book is taken up by his experiences at this time, when he saw a good deal of fighting. But more interesting are some of the difficulties in managing the troops under his command as general officer, and the notes made of the barbarous practice of flogging — fancy the horror of three hundred lashes! While disapproving the penalty, he once executed the sentence of a court martial in the presence of a mutinous regiment, controlling the men by his personal bearing alone. "It is unwise as well as impolitic to continue a description of punishment which, from its degrading and disgusting nature, puts men below the level of beasts," he writes.

In the siege of Oporto, during which his wife bravely stood beside him, "donkeys, dogs, cats and horse-flesh were eagerly devoured when-

ever procurable," and the ration (when issued) was "two ounces of rice, two ounces of salt fish, half a pint of port wine and one ship's biscuit." "A slice of dog, well-peppered, devilled, and fried in oil and butter on the lid of a mess-tin was a luxurious repast." What memories of "fried hardtack" does this not evoke for the veteran of the Army of the Potomac! After this war Bacon resided partly in England, partly in Portugal, striving to recover the moneys he had personally advanced to the cause he served — which of course he never recovered. It is not only republics which are ungrateful. When the Crimean War broke out he was nearing sixty, but being "without doubt the best cavalry officer I have ever seen," as Lord Anglesey had said, he expected a chance of service. He was grievously disappointed to have the command of the Seventeenth Lancers entrusted to another. He died in 1864. This volume, by his grandson, is well done, though one could wish that more of Bacon's own letters could have been quoted. It is light to hold and the print is clear. Unless the literature of the Boer and Spanish wars monopolize readers, it should have a good sale.

THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE.

Correspondence of Lady Burghersh with the Duke of Wellington. Edited by her daughter, LADY ROSE WEIGALL. (London: John Murray and Company. 1903. Pp. vii, 220.)

WHILE possessing in high measure the attributes of the great man of action, His Grace the Duke of Wellington has been usually characterized as of a stern unsympathetic nature, as a man who lived, through success and glory, fame and riches, a solitary, cheerless life. There is a grain of truth in this view of the great soldier, though many estimates of him exaggerate it, going so far as to represent him as sitting in his old age "lonely in the bleak and comfortless surroundings that he chose, while friendship and family affection passed him by." Yet the chief who so far won the regard of his subordinate officers in the Deccan that when he left that command they presented him with a service of plate worth £2,000 sterling — though this is measuring sentiment by a vulgar plutocratic yardstick — could scarcely have lacked the human quality. And while the duke's despatches from the Peninsula were wont now and then to exhibit scant appreciation of the fidelity, courage, and stanch soldierly qualities of his officers and men, yet it can scarcely be denied that he won the esteem and respect of all around him, to as high a degree as any captain, if he did not command enthusiasm and love after the fashion of an Alexander or a Gustavus.

Captain Arthur Wellesley was one of the aides-de-camp of the Earl of Westmoreland, who was lord lieutenant of Ireland from 1790 to 1795. When Sir Arthur went to Portugal in 1812 he took on his own staff Lord Burghersh, the son of his ancient chief; and this gentleman later married Sir Arthur's niece, Priscilla Anne, daughter of the Earl of Mornington. This couple remained attached to the Duke of Wellington by the warmest ties; and it was to "My Dearest Priscilla" that most of the letters in

this unusual volume are addressed. And because there exists in some circles an error which is deemed by those who loved him and whom he loved to be an injustice to his memory, Lady Rose Weigall, the daughter of Lady Burghersh, has consented to the publication of these letters, to "give some idea of what he was to his own friends and family."

The letters are simple and homely to the last degree. They deal in everything, from the duke's views in 1812 on the strategical situation in the Peninsula, to a simple agreement to meet "My dear Priscilla" at the train on its arrival at Dover on September 14, 1852. This last, unlike the duke, who was scrupulous in adherence to truth and promises, remained unfulfilled; for the great soldier died, rather suddenly, on the day he was to welcome his niece at Walmer Castle. In the letters there are many references to contemporary politics which may interest those familiar with the times; but nearly all of them are about personal matters. Sentences taken here and there from the letters best explain them. "The *Star* . . . told a person who repeated it to me that she had done everything in her power 'pour m'intéresser à elle' (what does she suppose me made of?) but she found I had no 'cœur pour l'amour'!!!" "I shall be sorry to lose the poor Americans!" (the Misses Caton). "You must for my sake protect them against their host of enemies when they go to England." This in 1817, when the memory of the War of 1812 was still rankling. "I am very sorry indeed to hear of the illness of General Neipperg. He would be a terrible loss to his friends, to the Empress Marie Louisa" (whose "morganatic husband" he was), "and to the Publick in general." "This transaction proves to me clearly not only that Lord Melbourne does not understand his business, but that there is nobody in the Cabinet who does!" — a thoroughly Wellingtonian phrase. "In the existing state of things [1837] they could not go on for a day in the House of Lords without me!" "We have a Queen of eighteen years of age. Supposing her to be an angel from Heaven, she cannot have the knowledge to enable her to oppose the mischief proposed to her." One phrase in a letter from Fuente-Guinaldo, May 25, 1812, is highly characteristic of the duke's painstaking Peninsular campaign. Speaking of Hill's fine raid on Almaraz having "given me the choice of lines of operation for the remainder of the campaign," he adds, "and do what we will, we shall be *safe*."

From the color of a cloak he was to give his niece to the illness of the Princess Victoria; from a slur at "gentlemen artists" (Lilley) to a timely charity to an old pensioner; from German politics to an accusation of mendacity to his political opponents, these letters are full of matter. The object sought by this publication has been fully attained: it is clear that the duke had under his irascible, prejudiced, antagonistic exterior a heart which beat warmly for distress, which loved his own with a true affection, and which was human to the core. He subscribed little to public charities, but gave largely in private; he would call each day on a sick friend; he could apologize to a servant for a scolding administered on wrong premises, and he showed great love for little children. While

showing how easy it has been to misapprehend his character, the letters are a fine tribute to the man.

This volume is beautifully published, with two fine portraits of the duke, one most apt rear-view sketch by Leslie of the duke walking, and so lovely a portrait of Lady Westmoreland that one does not wonder she was his "Dearest Priscilla."

THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE.

Mémoires de Langeron, Général d'Infanterie dans l'Armée Russe, Campagnes de 1812, 1813, 1814. Publiés d'après le manuscrit original pour la Société d'Histoire Contemporaine, par L.-G. F. (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1902. Pp. cxx, 524.)

ANDRAULT, COUNT LANGERON, the author of these memoirs, was born in Paris in 1763. Under Rochambeau he served with the French force in America in 1781. On the outbreak of the Revolution, he left the French for the Russian service, attained in the latter the rank of lieutenant-general in 1799, and died, after a distinguished career of forty years in his adopted country, at St. Petersburg in 1831. His memoirs on the wars of the First Coalition (Pingaud, *L'Invasion Austro-Prussienne, 1792-1794*) were published by the Société d'Histoire Contemporaine in 1895. In the present volume the memoirs for 1812 and 1813 are the more important. In March, 1814, Langeron distinguished himself before Paris by the storming of Montmartre, but the general insignificance of this campaign as compared with the previous ones is reflected unmistakably in his narrative.

In 1812 Langeron commanded under Tchitchagoff the army disengaged by the Turkish peace, which in September advanced from Moldavia upon the French line of communications, captured Minsk with its supplies, and took the crossing of the Beresina, but failed to hold it against Oudinot. The failure of this movement from the south to bar Napoleon's retreat Langeron ascribes in general to Tchitchagoff's tardiness—an opinion in which, contrary to Bogdanowitsch, the editor concurs. The latter, however, joins with Diebitsch in excusing Tchitchagoff's sudden digression from the Beresina on November 25, whereby Napoleon, according to Langeron and the received opinion, ultimately escaped. Between Tchitchagoff and Langeron, who appears to have been the superior of the two in ability, the feeling was such as debarred criticism mutually fair. Tchitchagoff, in a letter to Alexander I., once expressed a hope to be "delivered" from his subordinate. The latter in turn, comparing his chief to the Emperor Paul, ascribes to him every extravagance and vice of mind and heart.

Of more interest is his characterization of the Prussians and of Blücher, under whom he commanded a corps 48,000 strong in the campaigns of 1813-1814. Blücher he describes as a veteran hussar in the full sense of the word, a drunkard, gambler, and profligate, addicted in fact at sixty-six to "all the vices hardly excusable in youth," redeemed however by virtues martial and otherwise that made him soon the idol of

Russian and Prussian alike. The talents of Gneisenau are frankly acknowledged: his disposition, however, Langeron found repulsive. Muffling, who rivaled Gneisenau in ability, was amiable as well. Langeron's praise of the Prussians — princes, officers, and soldiery — in this contest is almost unmixed. "Never," he says, "did military honor reach a higher level." They had but one fault, insufferable arrogance. Even to Muffling, Langeron, then a veteran of twenty years in the Russian service, was, merely by reason of his French origin, repugnant. In this feeling Langeron's ignorance of German played a rôle, especially with Blücher, whose ignorance of French, unusual in a Prussian officer, debarred free intercourse with his Russo-French subordinate.

The volume is replete with the incidents which lend interest to works of its class. At Düben on October 9, 1813, Blücher and Langeron escaped capture by a narrow half-hour, and only as a result of Blücher's fondness for the chase. At Leipzig it fell to Langeron's lot to receive the Saxon regiments which deserted Napoleon on October 18; and on the following day, at imminent peril to his own life, he witnessed, from the bank of the Elster, the tragic death of his personal friend Poniatowski. Langeron's greatest achievement was the destruction of an entire French division 25,000 strong at the Katzbach and Loewenberg, August 26-29, 1813. This event and Napoleon's retreat in 1812 are the subjects of the editor's introduction, a careful study based upon public records at Paris, St. Petersburg, Vienna, and Dresden. A number of interesting documents from these sources, including Jomini's letters of resignation to Napoleon and Berthier, are included in the volume.

H. M. BOWMAN.

American Diplomacy in the Orient. By JOHN WATSON FOSTER. (New York and Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. 1903. Pp. xiv, 498.)

It is our Pacific orient that Mr. Foster means by this title, China, Japan, and the islands, not Turkey or Persia. Why our occident has been so universally called our orient, it is difficult to say. Perhaps because we sailed eastward to reach it or because we simply adopted the European term and point of view.

American diplomacy has largely concerned itself with commercial and private interests rather than with high politics, and in consequence a thoroughgoing history of it would be a dull affair. But by selection and treatment Mr. Foster's book has been made anything but dull. In his desire to be interesting he even seems to shrink sometimes from the full enumeration of those treaty provisions which are the results of diplomacy. Thus in the treaty of 1833 with Siam three lines are given to the treaty stipulations (p. 50), while the topics of opium trade prohibition, the prohibition of importing arms and of exporting rice, and the most favored nation clause in respect of duties are all omitted, though surely we would be glad to know why the question of opium in Siam was thus early treated.

In the dread of being dull, in the desire for picturesqueness, as it seems to me, Mr. Foster has been led now and then into a want of proportion between the trivial and the essential, between the amusing or interesting details of our diplomatic adventures in the Pacific, and the serious sum and substance of their results. It is a question also, for the sake of a clear and continuous narrative, whether the dealings with each country should not have been related from beginning to end. The form adopted has been to give a chapter to the early Chinese treaties, then one to our first dealings with Japan, then a description of Hawaii as an independent state, and so on. However, on the other hand, we are introduced to these backward countries at the same stage of their development, so that we get a comparative study of their progress, which is very likely more important than a continuous view.

Mr. Foster's account of our relations with China is clear and fair-minded. While emphasizing sufficiently the curious fact that American exclusion of the Chinese in these later days so closely parallels the exclusion of foreigners which China would practice if she could, he does justice to those numerous instances of good-will for China displayed by this country which show that, compared with others, the United States has been truly a friend. Thus the American merchants repaid duties suspended during the Taiping rebellion; the United States returned a portion of the Canton indemnity; it always supported the Chinese endeavor to forbid the import of opium, in contrast to British policy; it has only twice used force against China in spite of provocation; and Mr. Hay's recent course has been in line with these precedents of friendliness. Twice have our presidents vetoed anti-Chinese legislation; twice has the general government paid indemnity for anti-Chinese riots; once only has drastic domestic legislation violated treaty, and then after a brief interval it was legalized by treaty. So that on the whole we may say that in spite of local prejudice against the Chinese and of statutes dictated by that dislike, the attitude of the general government has been correct. Chinese statesmen have realized that the United States has had no sinister designs upon Chinese territory. And Li Hung Chang's statement that the German aggressiveness in Kiauchau was more than any other one thing the cause of the Boxer outbreak, quoted by Mr. Foster (p. 416), is in the same line. That missionaries have been objected to, not as propagating a hostile religious belief, but solely as foreigners, and not more disliked than foreign merchants, is forcibly declared. In fact Mr. Foster does ample justice, though no more than justice, to the part played by the American missionaries Williams, Martin, Allen in Corea, Gutzloff, and others in our earlier diplomacy. It may be added that Mr. Foster's own service under the Chinese government, as well as under our own, gives his views peculiar interest and value.

American diplomatic intercourse with China, such as it was, came about as the natural outgrowth of a growing trade and the necessity for its regulation and protection. There was nothing forced about it. With Japan, however, it was different. Perry's expedition was a positive first

breach in Japanese exclusiveness. His expedition and negotiations furnish Mr. Foster with the details for a dramatic narrative, well made use of. Here, too, American friendship to Japan is clearly set forth, culminating in our readiness to permit treaty revision which should cast off the shackles of a tariff set by the importer and of extraterritorial jurisdiction, a revision necessarily to be undertaken only in connection with our commercial rivals, and in point of fact not accepted by them until after the war with China in 1894. The effect of this war upon the international position of Japan is noted. But perhaps Mr. Foster might have added the reflection that in the divergent courses of China and Japan, the one rejecting, the other making use of modern ideas, we have a striking illustration of the fact that even to-day the position of a state in political society is the position that it has the power to enforce, and no more. Military power, or the possession of resources convertible into such power, is still the criterion of international status. Japan has been able to perform its international duties and insist upon its rights; China has been unable to do either.

Our relations with Hawaii are well set forth. The temptation to annex these favored islands seems to have been irresistible with half the European squadrons which visited them. That the United States could permit no such step is made clear. But that one administration after another disclaimed any desire to annex the Hawaiian Islands is not brought out. Yet with the exception of Mr. Marcy's oft-quoted despatch of 1853, there is hardly a state paper treating the question, from 1840 to the overthrow of the monarchy, which does not express this idea. Nor does Mr. Foster bring out the technical fault of American recognition of the new government in 1893, the day after the revolution, before the rest of Oahu and the other islands could show whether the new government had popular support or not. This was in violation of our usage in such cases.

These, however, are minor criticisms. The book is clearly and interestingly written, is eminently fair-minded, and should be read by those who desire knowledge of our relations with a part of the world whose future line of development is still so obscure. But that these relations are likely to be closer than ever before and to be fraught with great consequences to this country, we cannot avoid believing.

THEODORE S. WOOLSEY.

The True Abraham Lincoln. By WILLIAM ELEROY CURTIS. (Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1903. Pp. xiv, 409.)

A "true" biography without scandal is indeed a novelty, but this is the only strikingly original feature of Mr. Curtis's book. The author forbids criticism on this point, however, by stating that there were "no mysteries in his career to excite curiosity." "Of such a man, wrote a well-known writer, the last word can never be said. Each succeeding generation may profit by the contemplation of his strength and triumph."

The verdict on the book must rest, therefore, on its peculiar adaptation to the needs of the present generation.

The topical method adopted in this series frankly dismisses the more difficult problems of construction; those peculiar to it Mr. Curtis handles with some skill, but he fails to manifest that constant care in correlating facts which is so necessary to prevent repetition and contradiction. "John Johnson, Lincoln's step-brother," on page 30 is "John D. Johnson, his step-brother," on page 32; and Lincoln's temperance views on page 286 are not precisely those recorded on page 381. No amount of care and skill, moreover, could possibly disguise the fact that this form of treatment is not suited to a life of Lincoln. He was not versatile as were Franklin and Jefferson, nor was his career many-sided as was that of Washington. He occasionally applied his wonderful insight to the problems of diplomacy and war, but the central point of Mr. Curtis's chapters on "A Prairie Politician," "A President and His Cabinet," "A Commander-in Chief and his Generals," and "A Master in Diplomacy" is his ability to handle men; and nine-tenths of the contents of these chapters could be interchanged without altering their character. More serious is the fact that the disregard for chronology causes us to lose sight of the most significant feature of Lincoln's life — his continuous development.

This last criticism is closely akin to a word of praise. Undoubtedly many writers have overestimated the squalor of Lincoln's youth in order to enhance the story of his rise. Mr. Curtis is thoroughly conversant with the results of recent investigations into Lincoln's family and boyhood, and he presents material with regard to them which will be novel to many of his readers. In general he shows acquaintance with the best works on his subject. It is natural that a life of Lincoln should be saturated with anecdotes; in the thirty-six pages of the chapter on "How Lincoln appeared in the White House" are forty-seven; the average through the book is one to a page. It is not Lincoln alone that Mr. Curtis's modesty allows to speak, but many writers about Lincoln. Of the twenty-six pages of the last chapter, fifteen are in quotation-marks; Chapter IV., with twenty out of fifty pages quoted, is normal. The book is prefaced with a stanza from Lowell's Commemoration Ode and concludes with a quotation from Emerson. These many voices, though a little discordant on minor matters, all harmonize in accomplishing Mr. Curtis's design "to portray the character of Abraham Lincoln as the highest type of the American" (p. 1). "His errors were due to mercy and not to malice; to prudence and not to thoughtlessness or pride; to deliberation and not to recklessness" (p. 394).

The style reveals the newspaper correspondent; bright and readable, it is marred by loose and ambiguous phrases. "Never was an audience more completely electrified by human speech" (p. 105); Seward could not have been defeated by "a combination of the minority" (p. 197); and the context shows that Mr. Curtis does not consider that "avarice was the least of" Lincoln's "faults" (p. 74). This looseness some-

times extends to the logic; Mr. Curtis can hardly think that to return a private favor with an Indian agency was a notably "honorable discharge" of obligation (p. 34).

The lack of historical background is distinctly lamentable. If the sentence, "During long years of controversy, the pro-slavery party had hope of ultimate triumph, but until the election of Lincoln there was no actual treason or revolutionary act" (p. 161) means anything, it is the expression of a view long since discarded. The "Secessionists" did not control both houses of Congress in February, 1861; and the danger feared with regard to the counting of the electoral vote was military and not legislative (p. 166). Scarcely the most rabid Republican of 1861 would have called President Buchanan and General Duff Green "rebel leaders" (pp. 162-163). The men who came into conflict with Lincoln are almost invariably led by the most personal of motives. Douglas was "compelled to choose between the favor and support of the Buchanan administration and that of the people of Illinois. As the latter alternative was necessary to his public career, he adopted it" (p. 108). The treatment of Chase is extremely harsh.

Errors of typography are few and the dates are generally accurate, but there are a few slips of the pen; on page 187 Buchanan should be Pierce, and on page 207 Seward should be Chase. The illustrations are well selected, including eight pictures of Lincoln, and are attractively reproduced. The index is slight and inaccurate.

C. R. FISH.

Memories of a Hundred Years. By EDWARD EVERETT HALE.
(New York: The Macmillan Company. 1902. Two vols.,
pp. xiv, 318; ix, 321.)

Colonel Alexander K. McClure's Recollections of Half a Century.
(Salem, Mass.: The Salem Press Company. 1902. Pp. vii, 502.)

THESE two works, the one by an octogenarian, the other by one nearing the same mile-stone, the first from the facile pen of the well-known Boston clergyman and literary man, the second by the almost equally celebrated Philadelphia journalist and sometime politician, at once challenge the attention and awaken our interest. Very few men of their time have enjoyed a wider or more intimate acquaintance with those who were the leaders of the thought and life of the nation for the past half-century.

In view of the title of Dr. Hale's volumes, one might almost be pardoned for asking him the same question which he tells us a Philadelphia lady in unconscious ignorance put to him at the conclusion of a lecture on Washington, namely, whether he was personally acquainted with his hero. The *Memories*, in fact, go back as far as the French and Indian War. As the author informs us that his own recollections do not antedate Lafayette's visit in 1825, when Hale was three years of age, it is clear that a part of the remembering must necessarily be done by proxy. Indeed the author explains that they embrace what he happily calls

"keyhole views" of "his own generation and of the generation before his own," the latter being transmitted to him by the friends of his early years.

The work is neither history nor autobiography, but rather a succession of reminiscences of anecdotal character with offhand comments about many of the leading men and events of our past, loosely strung together in a highly entertaining and chatty way. Those who turn to it seeking either definite information or well-considered judgments will be doomed to disappointment. It leaves much to be desired in the accuracy of its historical details, and too often the violent prejudices of the author find free expression in its pages. While there is apparent a certain plan and method in the arrangement of the successive chapters, there is little continuity in the subject-matter. On the other hand, the peculiar charm and interest of the *Memories* come chiefly from the delightful personality of the author, which is revealed on every page. The vivacity and naturalness of his style, the wide range of his interests, the variety of his experiences, and the frankness with which he gives expression to his views — prejudiced though they may be — hold the reader's attention.

The first volume, which relates chiefly to the generation before his own, is the least interesting and valuable, and contains more blemishes, particularly where it treats of political affairs. In the second volume Dr. Hale deals with his own time, speaking of many of the men with whom he has been associated and of the causes with which he has been identified. His recollections of the leading orators, historians, and literary men of New England are entertaining, although they could hardly be expected to add materially to our knowledge of such familiar characters. The most interesting and valuable chapters, it seems to me, are those which relate to the antislavery movement and the Civil War. Dr. Hale's account of his own part in the work of the Emigrant Aid Companies and his relations with Eli Thayer is of the first importance, notably the reference to his pamphlet on *How to Conquer Texas before Texas Conquers Us*, written in 1845 shortly after the admission of Texas, advocating colonization by the free-states men nearly a decade before this plan was employed in settling Kansas. It is such personal experiences as these that lead the reader to regret that the author did not reserve more of his space for such important and enlightening glimpses into the history of his own day.

There remains the unpleasant task of noting some of the blemishes alluded to above. A good example of the extent to which he has absorbed, perhaps unconsciously, the prejudices of the old New England Federalists is seen in his treatment of Jefferson and "poor Mr. Madison" and the other members of what he "likes to call the Virginia Dynasty," with "their failures and follies, their fuss and feather and fol-de-rol." Jefferson as President, he considers, occupies "the place in history which a fussy and foolish nurse fills in the biography of a man like Franklin, or Washington, or Goethe, or Julius Cæsar." Again, prejudice is seen in his reference to the English government as having "crowded peace

down the throats of the American envoys," at the close of the War of 1812. One can readily permit the author of *The Man without a Country* the privilege of devoting some twenty pages to the relatively unimportant history of the true Philip Nolan; but what shall be said of the historic judgment which attributes to his unjust execution the origin of American enmity to Spain, the annexation of Texas, and our hatred of Spain from that day to the recent Spanish-American War? Certainly the reader cannot fail to be amused at the suggestion that Texas should erect a statue to Philip Nolan, either in the state's own capitol or in that of the nation, to perpetuate the resentment of the Southwest to Spanish treachery.

Dr. Hale tells us that he has "a memory of iron," but it frequently proves unreliable in matters of detail, as the following citations attest: He refers to Fisher Ames as a member of the Senate rather than of the House (I. 17). Jackson's visit to Boston is placed in 1830 (I. 271) rather than the correct date, 1833. Webster's speech defending his retention of office in Tyler's administration is given as in 1841 (II. 38), whereas it was in the following year. Webster is spoken of as secretary of state in 1844 (II. 35), although he had retired from the cabinet in the previous year. He gives the date of South Carolina's Negro Seaman's Act as in 1823 (II. 128) instead of 1822. Dr. Hale also errs in thinking that the first national convention was that of the Democratic party in 1832 (I. 232). It is well known that this institution was the important contribution to national politics of the short-lived Antimasonic party. He fails to state correctly Clay's share in the Missouri Compromise (I. 234); and in his treatment of the Monroe doctrine he apparently confuses the question of colonization with that of the independence of the South American states (I. 246). A little more regard for "modern historical realism" and "the dry-as-dust historians," as Dr. Hale calls them, would have saved him from these and many other lapses.

The work is enriched with numerous illustrations, reproductions of portraits, broadsides, autograph letters, and other original material.

Colonel McClure, unlike Dr. Hale, has confined his *Recollections* to the last half-century. His volume likewise is neither an autobiography nor a connected history, but a collection of some fifty miscellaneous sketches of men prominent in the civil and military history of the republic, together with papers upon important events in the nation's life. In those character-sketches in which he gives us the results of his personal acquaintance he is at his best, and the portrait that he draws may usually be accepted as true to life. Unfortunately, however, he has included in this volume a number of papers of a different character which are little more than compilations that any well-equipped writer might have prepared from secondary works.

Among the best of the first class may be mentioned his sketches of the various presidents from Lincoln to McKinley, his noble tribute to Henry Wilson, his sympathetic account of the career of Samuel J. Randall, and his able and interesting study of Grant and McClellan, in which he contrasts the aggressive and the defensive general. In the main

Colonel McClure is discriminatingly just in his estimates and dispassionate in his criticisms; only occasionally is his personal bias or prejudice apparent. His style is that of the experienced journalist, simple and easy, although it is not especially picturesque. The work may be considered substantially free from errors of fact.

HERMAN V. AMES.

Horace Greeley, Founder and Editor of The New York Tribune. By WILLIAM ALEXANDER LINN. (New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1903. Pp. xiii, 267.)

THIS volume is the third in Appletons' "Series of Historic Lives." Thwaites's biographies of Father Marquette and Daniel Boone preceded it, and A. C. Buell's sketch of Sir William Johnson is now its successor. Mr. Linn's studies of character in his excellent *Story of the Mormons* probably afforded him less preparation for this portraiture of Horace Greeley than he derived from his experience as a journalist in New York city and in the office of the *Tribune*. He has, therefore, enjoyed the advantage of a personal acquaintance with his subject.

Throughout this little volume the skill of the expert news-writer is pleasantly evident. The story runs quickly and lucidly. There is no verbiage. The dramatic situations are seized, and Greeley is made to reveal, usually in his own words, the defects and the virtues of his personality. In the preface the outline of the whole sketch is condensed into one sentence:

. . . A gawky country lad, with a limited education and a slight acquaintance with the printer's trade, comes to the principal city of the land with a few dollars in his pocket and a single suit of clothes, and fights a fight the result of which is the founding of the most influential newspaper of his day, and the acquirement of a reputation as its editor which secures for him a nomination for the presidency of the United States. . . . (p. 5).

In less than sixty pages is summarized the story of Greeley's earlier career, of his evolution from a poverty-stricken country boy in New England into an editor of a literary weekly in New York city, a Whig politician and pamphleteer, and a protégé of Thurlow Weed. Fifty pages more contain the story of the foundation of the *Tribune* in 1841, and an analytical estimate of the relations between Greeley's personality and the newspaper that he had created. One chapter is devoted to Greeley's advocacy of a protective tariff down to the era of the Mexican War, and another chapter to the attitude of Greeley and his paper towards the slavery question down to the outbreak of the Civil War.

In the decade 1850-1860 Greeley stood at the zenith of his influence and reputation. His word was law among the northern farmers, who had learned to read the *Weekly Tribune* as though it were a weekly Gospel. Raymond's *Times* was probably more popular in New York city than the *Tribune*, but Raymond himself, when berating Greeley for his unrelenting opposition to Seward's nomination in 1860, referred to the *Tribune* as "the most influential political newspaper in the country." Perhaps Bennett's *Herald* had more readers, yet Bennett was not

highly respected, and no one thought of the *Herald* as an oracle. But Greeley had become the journalistic representative of the conscience of the North. Only Governor Seward knew what unworthy passions had warped the great editor, and until 1860 Seward kept that knowledge to himself.

In the last two chapters Mr. Linn presents the evidences of Greeley's decline and fall, his fierce yearning for office, his jealousy of Raymond and the *Times*, his puerile egotism and lack of balance, his distrust and captious criticism of Lincoln, his friendliness with the more disreputable elements of the local Republican party who followed the fortunes of Reuben E. Fenton, and finally the extraordinary pliability which made him the presidential candidate of his lifelong enemies.

Incidentally Mr. Linn makes it plain that Greeley profited by the advice and assistance of a remarkable company of associates. Men like Henry J. Raymond, Sidney Howard Gay, Charles A. Dana, and George Ripley helped to make the *Tribune*, to build up the influence of its editor-in-chief, and to correct the vagaries of that versatile genius. Mr. Linn barely glances at the vulgarities of speech and manner which so often made Greeley appear to his companions like an overgrown and badly-trained boy. Indeed, if the gossip that still circulates among those who knew Greeley is true, it would be impossible to put in print a faithful description of the man in his petty moods, and yet he was the very soul of courtesy and tenderness to those who could claim his affection, and even to those who could not he was often over-generous.

A man of genius and a lovable nature, he was, nevertheless, as Mr. Linn suggests, a living illustration of the need of a thorough training in the schools. Horace Greeley educated himself by native intellectual force, but it is clear that he never acquired that sanity, steadiness of judgment, and self-control which are among the finest flowers of character, and which may be cultivated amid the formative intimacies of college life. Mr. Linn's study of the great editor should be read as a companion volume to Greeley's *Recollections of a Busy Life*. With the two works in hand, it should be easy to evoke once more the attractive, powerful, and yet disappointing personality of Horace Greeley.

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE.

The Impeachment and Trial of Andrew Johnson. By DAVID MILLER DEWITT. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1903. Pp. 646.)

THIS book is one of the most important which have yet appeared dealing with that comparatively untouched field, the Reconstruction period. It is something more than an account of the impeachment and trial; it is also a picture-gallery and presents several old faces in colors not altogether familiar to students or creditable to the originals. The introduction, more than one hundred pages, is devoted to a statement of the theories and problems of Reconstruction and to an account of the struggle between the President and Congress to carry out their respective

plans. The rest of the book gives a very full account of the various unsuccessful attempts at impeachment, the impeachment, the trial, and the acquittal. Speeches made in Congress and by the President are epitomized and quoted freely. The book might very well be called "The Vindication of Andrew Johnson," but, be it said to the credit of the author, in vindicating a much maligned President he has seldom displayed offensive partizanship; he has simply allowed the actors in this not very creditable drama to speak for themselves.

It has frequently been charged that President Johnson was largely responsible for bringing on the conflict with Congress. Professor Burgess, who certainly cannot be charged with partiality toward Congress, says that he was "low-born and low-bred, violent in temper, obstinate, coarse, and lacking in the sense of propriety." But if he displayed violence of temper and vindictiveness of spirit, Mr. Dewitt shows that he did so under great provocation. Even his conduct on the famous "swing around the circle," which affords a good example of his coarseness and lack of dignity, may be explained, though not excused. Up to and including the veto of the Freedman's Bureau bill, the President can hardly be said to have done anything to provoke Congress except to point out with irrefutable logic the unconstitutional ground upon which Congress was treading. Soon after this followed the notorious speech of February 22, in which he used language unbecoming to his station and highly exasperating to Congress. Yet Senator Sherman pointed out that he had been provoked by men in and out of Congress who had classed him with Arnold and Burr and had said that he deserved to lose his head as Charles I. had done.

Over against this combative disposition of the President the author has set forth the characters of his leading opponents. Thaddeus Stevens is described as the "soul of vindictiveness" and is compared to Marat for the "audacity" of his convictions. The liminary provisions of the Constitution gave him no trouble. This leader of the opposition was also a leader in insolence, as is shown by his ironical defense of the President against the charge that he was "an insolent drunken brute, in comparison with whom even Caligula's horse was respectable." Sumner is compared to Robespierre in his indifference to the lives of men who threw themselves in his way. Human rights, in the abstract, were the object of his intellectual worship, though he cared naught for the individuals to whom the rights belonged. If there was any doubt about the guilt of this "successor of Jefferson Davis", said he, it should be resolved according to the "law of the majority." The President's "barefaced treachery" made him "alone in bad eminence, alone in the evil he has done." This characterization is all the more surprising since even Senator Ross credits Sumner with a desire to deal fairly with the President.¹

The attempt of Ashley, Butler, and Boutwell to implicate Johnson in the assassination of Lincoln is not very creditable either to their honesty, mental penetration, or sense of justice. Boutwell clung to the notorious

¹ *Forum*, XX. 222.

Conover, *alias* Dunham, who implicated Johnson in the plot, even after being confronted with his perjury; and Ashley actually sought to secure the pardon of this scoundrel by the President in order to secure through the man thus set free evidence convicting of complicity in the murder of his predecessor the one who exercised the clemency.

It is now generally acknowledged that Grant comes out of this controversy with a record by no means enviable. According to Mr. Dewitt's account, which bears the stamp of veracity, if Grant's own admissions may be relied upon, the general's conduct in failing to hold the office of secretary of war or to deliver it to the President after the Senate refused to sanction the dismissal of Stanton cannot be very easily palliated. There seems to be no question that up to the time of his surrender of the office to Stanton, Grant left upon the mind of the President the impression that he accepted the office *ad interim* as his friend in order to help him get rid of Stanton. But now the general admits that he accepted it for the purpose of circumventing Johnson in his wish to appeal to the courts to rid himself of an obnoxious secretary. "This tacit deception," says the President, "is allowable in the ethics of some people."

But the most discreditable record of all is that of the protean Stanton. He has been pictured as one of the few reliable patriots in Buchanan's cabinet, the Atlas whose mighty efforts saved the Union from utter ruin before the inauguration of Lincoln, and as a great war secretary. His administrative ability does not seem to be questioned, but Mr. Dewitt presents a far different account of his political career. The picture here presented is that of a double-dealer, a two-faced man, to use no harsher terms, a man who always sought to be on the winning side. There is a strange ring about the patriotism which prompted him to write to Buchanan after the outbreak of hostilities and assure him that his policy had been vindicated and that "Jeff" Davis would soon "turn out the whole concern," referring to Lincoln's cabinet. While "cursing Mr. Lincoln himself with bitter curses" for suppressing freedom of speech, he was on terms of intimacy with the radical element of his cabinet and approving "important passages" recommending freeing and arming the slaves in their reports. At last he succeeded in working himself into Lincoln's cabinet, an appointment made with reluctance at the earnest solicitation of Secretary Cameron. Throughout the first two years of Johnson's administration he gave his support in most cases and his cordial acquiescence in others to the most of the President's plans, but at the same time kept up a sort of connection with the radical element in Congress. When the Tenure-of-Office bill was laid before the cabinet, no member was more emphatic than Stanton in his views as to its unconstitutionality. But soon after the passage of this bill he threw off the mask.

The shamelessness of the Senate is laid completely bare. That body was deliberately packed in violation of law and justice for the avowed purpose of bringing about condemnation. Senators declared their intention to vote for condemnation even before the evidence had been heard. Proof? What need of proof beyond "common fame," "common re-

port of misconduct"? Evidence vital to the defense was deliberately shut out. The pressure brought to bear upon doubtful senators to secure their votes for condemnation would have been unworthy of a Tudor Parliament passing a bill of attainder. This was done in no haphazard way, but systematically, by the "Union Congressional Committee," to which even senators belonged. But all to no purpose. In spite of a mosaic article patched up out of the others in the hope of securing the doubtful votes for conviction by the "obscurity of its charges and the intricacy of its forms," the one vote necessary was lacking, and Andrew Johnson was acquitted.

But the vindictive House was not satisfied. Spies had been set upon the President and Chief-Justice Chase, and now a movement was set on foot to investigate whether the acquittal had not been secured by bribery, pointing directly at Senator Ross. This, however, the Senate resented.

It is one of the ironies of history that the President's accusers should now stand condemned on the very charges which they brought against him — vindictiveness, coarseness, lack of dignity. While they were nervous, excited, peevish, irascible, and abusive, he was calm, dignified, even cheerful, demeaning himself as an extraordinary man. One thing in particular which is indicative of nobility of character was his suppression of the reason of Black's withdrawal from the defense at a time when this was being thrown in his face as a sign of the weakness of his cause. Is the reader surprised at this picture, or series of pictures, presented by the author? They appear to have been made up of material the reliability of which it would be hard to impeach.

In spite of the flimsy character of the charges, this trial was a highly dramatic event. The suspense of the country was intense and the commonly-accepted notion is that the same was true of the Senate until Senator Ross had answered "Not Guilty." Herein the author has shown his ability to appreciate dramatic effect and has imparted to the reader something of the suspense which held a nation's breath. There is a story to the effect that the suspense was not so great in the Senate, at least on the part of all; that, in fact, there was some kind of an arrangement for the acquittal of the President. However, this story, which is hardly more creditable to the Senate than the trial, has never been fully proved and does not deserve repetition here.

On the whole the style is good, but a few slips occur. The author refers to "Hancock's celebrated order" (p. 315), but does not explain what that order was. At page 325 he says that Grant had been "engaged in a conference with General Sherman and many little matters." He also tells us that "Sumner out with the naked truth" (p. 190). The expression "of like kidney" is rather offensive to a reader of refined taste.

DAVID Y. THOMAS.

Aus Eduard Lasker's Nachlass. VON EDUARD LASKER. Edited by Dr. Wilhelm Cahn. (Berlin: Georg Reimer. 1902. Pp. vi, 168.)

THE house of Georg Reimer in Berlin has distinguished itself more than once by undertaking the publication of historical material of the first order, independently of the question whether it might reasonably anticipate immediate pecuniary returns. One of its last contributions for which we venture to express the gratitude of students is the first part of Lasker's memoirs.

This first part covers the parliamentary activity between 1866 and 1880, years which may be said to represent the golden time of German constitutional government — the period during which Bismarck needed the liberal party for his schemes of national federation. In this liberal party he found the brains capable of popularizing a movement which had many opponents among those who dreaded any innovation. In those days the liberals of Germany were the warmest Bismarckians, for Bismarckianism was then synonymous with liberalism. In that golden age Bismarck paid his court to those who soon afterwards were publicly branded as traitors to the crown. We have but to recall such names as Mommsen, Virchow, Bunsen, Bamberger, and finally Lasker. The student of modern Germany cannot afford to miss these pages of Lasker, for while he was a man little given to demonstrative activity, he was, like Bamberger, a keen observer, a man of profound study, a cool, impartial (*objectiv*), statesmanlike politician, and as such a reporter of his times who cannot fail to rank as first-rate authority.

It seems but yesterday that we had the pleasure of greeting Lasker in New York. It was in the winter of 1883/1884. He died in our midst, mourned sincerely by German liberals throughout the world. Such men as he are necessarily more rare in Germany than in England or America, for the reason that Germany offers scarcely any means of livelihood or distinction to any man who has not from babyhood been trained by a paternal government to think only what the government has first pronounced to be fit for thought. Much of Bismarck's greatness arose from the fact that his ambitions coincided with the convictions of Germany's most eminent thinkers. When, after 1876, Bismarckianism came to represent other aims, notably protection, then the thinkers of Germany who did not change their manner of thinking to suit the exigencies of the Wilhelm Strasse found themselves denounced by the government as renegades, unpatriotic cosmopolitans, bad Germans — in short, every name that party bitterness could suggest.

Lasker's plea for free trade (p. 136) might well have been spoken on the floor of the American Senate as well as in the Reichstag, for it raises the controversy high above the mists of Bismarckian opportunist skirmish — up into the high and dry light of statesmanlike discussion. The protectionist arguments of Bismarck were from the standpoint of a single class or political fraction whose votes he needed. The language of Lasker is that of a statesman who as a member of the imperial parliament knows

no higher duty than that which he owes to the whole empire. Those who wish to understand the causes of Bismarck's ultimate fall in 1890 will seek for it in vain in the memoirs of the Iron Chancellor or in the writings of those who regard him as having been sacrificed to the ambition of his emperor. Bismarck was successful so long as his duties lay in exercising the talents which had earned for him the nickname of Iron Chancellor. When, however, after the adoption of the federal imperial constitution, other qualities besides those of the man of iron were needed, Bismarck commenced to move gently downward through a series of political errors which even he, with the whole machinery of a servile press and bureaucracy, could not wholly conceal from the public or from the penetrating eyes of the present Emperor. On this theme Lasker in the little work we are discussing throws many interesting side-lights.

POULTNEY BIGELOW.

Studies in Contemporary Biography. By JAMES BRYCE. (New York : The Macmillan Company ; London : Macmillan and Company. 1903. Pp. ix, 487.)

THIS volume is intended especially for the general reader, but is also worth the careful attention of the historical student, not only because any fragment of Mr. Bryce's work is of interest, but because a historian who is also a prominent man of affairs here presents us with the cream of his personal experience in studies of the most prominent figures among his associates in the English public and scholastic life of the later nineteenth century. The selection may seem at times a somewhat arbitrary and uneven one, and from the point of view of the adequate representation of the author's notable contemporaries there are certainly important omissions ; this is apparently due not only to the confining of attention to those who have died, but also to the degree in which the writer was guided by the element of personal knowledge. The list bears striking testimony to the wide extent of the interests and friendships of Mr. Bryce, since with most of the men here treated he was on an intimate footing. One or two names (as that of Edward Bowen, an assistant master at Rugby) that are unknown outside of comparatively narrow English circles are included. In the effort, as the author says, "to do what a friend can do to present a faithful record of their excellence which may help to keep their memory fresh and green." One is not inclined to cavil at such an effort, especially as in the case of Bowen the sketch serves to set strongly before the non-English (and particularly the American) reader how in England even a subordinate teacher in a great public school may in some degree become a national figure. We are warned in the preface that "these studies are not to be regarded as biographies even in miniature. My aim has rather been to analyse the character and powers of each of the persons described, and as far as possible, to convey the impression which each made in the daily converse of life."

There are in all twenty studies : Lord Beaconsfield, Dean Stanley, T. H. Green, Archbishop Tait, Anthony Trollope, J. R. Green, Sir

George Jessel, Lord Cairns, Bishop Fraser, Sir Stafford Northcote, Parnell, Cardinal Manning, E. A. Freeman, Robert Lowe, W. Robertson Smith, Henry Sidgewick, E. E. Bowen, E. L. Godkin, Lord Acton, W. E. Gladstone. Critical examination is not necessary to show that we are under a large debt to Mr. Bryce for these studies. They are primarily records of the impressions made by recent famous Englishmen upon one of the most distinguished of their associates, a man who is also one of the most keen and cosmopolitan observers of his time; as such they could not fail to be helpful. They are all marked by insight and candor; whether Mr. Bryce is writing of close friends or of those (as Parnell) whom he evidently was not prepared to admit to his friendship, we can have no suspicion of his entire fairness. There is still evidence of special research, but this is in entire keeping with the aim of the author and the desire of the intelligent reader; even if the time had come for elaborate biographical labor in these cases, and even if we could desire Mr. Bryce to give his time to this, it is improbable that such effort would have made the sketches any more worth while to us. They are all carefully written, are in a high degree interesting, and are frequently marked by felicitous phrases and characterizations, by keen distinctions and telling generalizations. Not infrequently, too, we find valuable additions to our information on recent events from the vantage-ground of the author's inside knowledge; as when we are told of Parnell that "he had no grasp of constitutional questions, and was not able to give any help in the construction of a Home Rule scheme in 1886" (p. 230).

Two of the papers much exceed the others in extent and are manifestly the fruit of special effort — that on Disraeli, which opens the volume, and that on Gladstone, which closes it. There is nothing startling in either, but both are acute and penetrating and throw much light upon the men; it is not strange, perhaps, that neither is quite satisfying. The Disraeli one is somewhat unsympathetic, and it may be doubted whether Mr. Bryce was in a position to observe very fully or quite adapted to comprehend fully this baffling figure. He tells us in the preface that he did not know him personally. In the case of Gladstone one cannot but suspect our author of being still in some degree under the glamour of his great leader, and one doubts whether Gladstone will continue to hold in English annals the place that Bryce would assign him. However that may be, nothing could be more open-minded than the manner in which he discusses natures and careers the complexity and problems of which he feels very strongly; and no student of these men will do well to neglect his analyses. Next to these the most interesting sketches for students of history will probably be those of J. R. Green, Freeman, and Lord Acton. Green he rates as a great historian, much higher than the later period of distrust has left him; his comments on Freeman do not provoke dissent; and he throws some new light on the dim and attractive figure of Lord Acton.

On the whole it must be acknowledged that Mr. Bryce was fortunate in his friends, and that this group of latter-day Englishmen seem for the

most part to have been as wholesome and attractive in their personalities and personal relations as they were effective and vigorous in their life-work. Great and little, they form a pleasant and stimulating company.

VICTOR COFFIN.

England, India, and Afghanistan. An Essay upon the Relations, Past and Future, between Afghanistan and the British Empire in India. [The Le Bas Prize Essay, 1902.] By FRANK NOYCE, B.A. (London: C. J. Clay and Sons; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1902. Pp. xii, 174.)

THIS book, as the title indicates, is a monograph treating historically of one phase or division of the problem of Asia. The author deserves congratulations because of the motive with which the task was undertaken and because in no other place within so small a compass, certainly, has the question of Afghanistan in its unity been described for the student of world politics. Beginning with a brief introductory survey of the earlier relations of Afghanistan to India, Mr. Noyce summarizes in twenty pages the disastrous history of the first Afghan War. The middle period, from 1842 to 1875 (pp. 32-69), is followed by chapters on the second Afghan War, on the reign of Abdur Rahman Khan (1880-1901), and on the present state and future prospects of the problem. In the opening pages the author rightly points out the difficulty which the results of party government often place in the way of the investigator in modern foreign politics. A large part of the literature dealing with almost any British imperial interest of the last century has been affected not merely by national prejudice but by party rancor; thus even if ability and opportunity for accurate information be granted in certain writers, it may be necessary to discover their views concerning Parliamentary reform, the adoption of free trade, or Irish home rule, in order to judge whether their conclusions with respect to Papineau's rebellion, the labor question in Jamaica, or the Armenian massacres can be accepted as non-partizan. In this respect if not in others this book is safe; for the reviewer has tried in vain to discover the author's party affiliation. But, though praise and blame are on the whole fairly distributed to the various agents of the unstable policies evolved between Westminster and Simla, the general impression gathered is that national prejudice has not been so successfully eliminated. Aside from phrases here and there such as that found on p. 173 ("the contempt of the Mahomedan (*sic*) religion they [the Russians] have shown in Central Asia"), which is erroneous, the author has failed to realize that his inadequate treatment of Russian policy, which amounts almost to an exclusion, must result in the mystification of the reader as to the inwardness of Central Asian politics. The lack of any save English authorities (the *Autobiography of Abdur Rahman Khan* excepted) in the very short bibliography is further evidence of the insular attitude of the author, while such a reference as occurs on p. 124 to the "untutored Oriental" should certainly give pause.

It was inevitable that as British prestige and dominion increased in India, the sphere of British Asiatic policy should become continental as well as maritime. Yet the inauguration of diplomatic negotiations with both Persia and Afghanistan might well have been postponed for many years, had not Napoleon Bonaparte by his Egyptian expedition and later by his alliance with Russia alarmed English rulers in India. The author recognizes the influence of the French, but fails to show how thoroughly persuaded were such men of affairs as Henry Dundas (Lord Melville), the Marquis of Wellesley, Lord Nelson, and Sir John Shore (Lord Teignmouth) that British power in India was seriously endangered by Napoleon's plans, and that an active diplomacy in lands to the north and west of India was essential. The missions of Malcolm to Teheran and of Elphinstone to Kabul (1801, not 1802 as on p. 16) were results of Napoleonic politics. Later the substitution of Russia for France as the threatening European power further emphasized the importance of Afghan politics to British India. The summary of the period 1835-1876 is confused, though it shows appreciation of the necessity of the historical method in the study of a contemporary problem. The author condemns Lord Auckland unreservedly for the first Afghan War, but is uncertain regarding Lord Lytton's personal responsibility in 1877-1878. He states (p. 71) that Lord Lytton "knew singularly little of India when he started to govern it, and his opportunities for independent study were limited by the fact that he was chosen to be the instrument for executing a policy preconceived by his political leaders." But on the next page we find that "Lord Lytton was given a very free hand by his leaders," and on p. 98 a parallel is drawn between Bismarck's use of the Benedetti incident at Ems and Lytton's use of the Ali Masjid incident in 1878 — "in each case a scheming statesman was supplied with a pretext, for which he had long wished for bringing about a war he eagerly desired." The ignorance of Lord Salisbury and his ill-conceived assumptions in essential matters as shown in despatches (*Afghan Blue Book*, 1878, pp. 128, 224), when added to the mistakes of Lord Lytton, resulted in a diplomatic and administrative collapse from which only the army under Roberts could extricate the British. The twenty years of Abdur Rahman Khan are favorably reviewed; and in the last chapter the author after discussing various possible occurrences concludes that the *status quo* is safe for a time under Habibullah, and that Great Britain should continue to support an independent friendly government in Afghanistan as long as possible.

The book is written in a confused style, the language here and there being doubtful in point of grammar; and certain archaic forms of English spelling are found, such as "shew." In the matter of oriental names the results are distressing and often inconsistent, e. g. Vakil and Wali, Mohamed and Mohammedan. Throughout are found Moghul for Mughal, Mahratta for Maratha, Peishwa for Peshwa, Mahdaji Sindia for Mahadaji Sindhia, *jehad* for *jihad*, Mohamed for Muhammad, etc. General Abrahamoff (p. 89) may be a printer's error for Abramov.

However, in comparing this book with earlier Le Bas prize essays the reader will be impressed with the decided advance in method and scholarship, though he will regret that as the foot-notes have come in style has gone out.

ALFRED L. P. DENNIS.

A Short History of Rome. By W. S. Robinson, M.A., formerly Assistant Master at Wellington College. (New York, Longmans Green, and Company, 1903, pp. viii, 486.) The author declares in his preface that while wars and politics "are not, it is said, all the life of a nation . . . they are that part of its life which determines its fate, and it is in the behaviour of a nation in its wars and politics that we can study its character." Whether this dogma be correct or not, his book must be judged from the success with which he has carried out his own theory of historical interpretation. The principle thus enunciated has been applied with remarkable faithfulness and persistence. A chapter on Roman Literature, which is simply a chronological list of authors with very brief notices of each, and a similar chapter on Roman Life are the only exceptions. Even the many interesting questions of Roman constitutional history do not suffice to draw him aside for more than a few lines. Such a mode of treatment naturally brings individuals into prominence and gives an opportunity for the portrayal of the characters of the great men of Rome. The preface, again, explains that the attempt has been made "to tell the story so as to arouse some interest in the personal fortunes of the actors in the great drama of war and politics, which developed a single small republican state into a world empire under the sway of a single ruler." This promise is not fulfilled; clear, simple, and concise the style is, but it is at the same time dry, and the greatest men along with the least are very lifeless.

Of the four hundred and twenty-five pages devoted to political history, three hundred and sixty-four go to the period of the Republic. The later period "has been continued, with gradually decreasing detail, far enough to bridge over the gap between ancient and mediæval times." Much space is given to the early period. Here narrative alternates with the explanation that the story is more or less legendary; though explanation is sometimes omitted where it would seem particularly necessary, as in the case of the legend of the sacred geese (p. 57). Such is, of course, the usual method of careful scholars who still hold to the orthodox view of early Roman history; but it is unfortunate that such an elaborate process should be necessary, especially in a small book, to tell us that we know little or nothing of those centuries. The account of the wars and politics of the later Republic is the strong part of the book. The narrative of the last one hundred years is remarkably well balanced, but the consistent neglect of constitutional and social history sometimes puts the author in straits. The chapter on the establishment of the Principate is, however, excellent, showing that the neglect of constitutional history is not due to the inability of the author

to deal with it. The work ends at about the year 395. In spite of its omissions and its faulty proportions, teachers will find it a clear, careful, concise, and usable account of the political history of Rome. It has more than sufficient merit to make it worth while to supply its deficiencies from other books or by means of lectures. As a work of reference for school libraries it will also be of real value, for its treatment of individual themes is often unusually successful. A number of small but useful maps are inserted in the text. At the head of each chapter are lists of important dates and of prominent men. Now and then chronological summaries are given. This is the total of the teaching apparatus which is provided.

A. C. TILTON.

The Religion of the Teutons. By P. D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, D.D. [Handbooks on the History of Religions, edited by Morris Jastrow, Jr. Vol. III.] (Boston and London, Ginn and Company, 1902, pp. viii, 504.) Professor Saussaye, of Leiden, well known for his *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, here presents a study of Teutonic heathenism, tracing its history down to about A. D. 1000, when the various tribes had been at least nominally Christianized. Professor J. B. Vos, of Johns Hopkins University, is responsible for the English dress in which the book appears. The author divides his materials into two parts: first, a history of the periods and peoples, embracing eleven chapters, which have appeared also in Dutch; and secondly, a discussion of the facts respecting the deities, myths, cults, etc., embracing ten chapters, followed by a conclusion. There is a select but extensive bibliography, and a good index.

The book is evidently tentative, as indeed it must be in view of the incomplete nature of the evidence at present available in this field. The linguistic and archaeological evidence for Teutonic origins is very cautiously handled, and the same may be said of the statements of Roman historians and geographers. Our author hesitates to make any very definite affirmations respecting the "prehistoric period," or to draw inferences from the names of the deities. The favorite theories about the original home of the Teutons and their race migrations are treated with critical impartiality, and with general skepticism. No parallelism between Teutonic and Slavic myths is admitted, nor will the author attempt to define the boundary between Kelt and Teuton, although he admits that such a boundary may now be said to exist. He recognizes a "genuine Teutonic kernel" in the heroic saga (*Beowulf* and the *Edda*), but there is also much later accretion. The religious elements are all relatively late. The debt of modern civilization to the Teutons is rightly declared to be insignificant, as compared with that to the classic world and to Christianity. The book is distinctly conservative, but none the less valuable. It marks a real advance toward a sounder knowledge of Teutonic antiquity and religion than we have hitherto possessed.

J. W. P.

A History of the American Church to the close of the Nineteenth Century. By the Right Reverend Leighton Coleman, S.T.D., LL.D., Bishop of Delaware. (London, Rivingtons, 1903, pp. 112.) The American Church which the Bishop of Delaware has in mind is, as he remarks in his preface, "known in law as the Protestant Episcopal Church." As a contribution to the series known as "The Oxford Church Text Books", the manual is accommodated to the point of view of the Anglo-Catholic party. The term Puritan is used interchangeably with Dissenters, and in the author's use of it includes Quakers, Anabaptists, and a motley array of minor sects. The spread of the Anglo-Catholic spirit is shown in considerable detail, but there is a total omission of the name of Phillips Brooks. Bishop Coleman's incapacity for writing history is shown by his allegation that the Puritans, having stipulated the conversion of the Indians as one of the main objects of their charters, "showed, upon their arrival in New England, but little regard for the spiritual welfare of these ignorant people. They were described by opprobrious epithets and at times cruelly assaulted and murdered." Dr. Coleman apparently has never heard of the missionary legislation of the Massachusetts General Court in 1644 and 1646, of the work and office of Gookin, of the missionary zeal of Roger Williams, or of the Mayhews. It would appear, however, that knowledge or ignorance is a matter of selection, for Eliot's missionary work and its large results are credited to the Church of England on the ground that Eliot before leaving England had been ordained in the Church of England.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

The Lords Baltimore and the Maryland Palatinate. By Clayton Colman Hall, LL.B., A.M. (Baltimore, John Murphy Company, 1902, pp. xvii, 216.) For this little volume we are indebted to the Maryland Society of the Colonial Dames of America, which made provision for the six lectures contained in it; to the faculty of Johns Hopkins University, who selected the particular subject and appointed the lecturer; and to Mr. Hall, who first delivered the lectures at that university and later gave them to a larger public in the form in which we now have them. In preparing these lectures Mr. Hall undoubtedly looked more closely into the *Calvert Papers* than had any previous writer in this field, and the result is that he has here and there thrown some new light on the personalities of the Lords Baltimore and on the dispute over the boundary between Maryland and Pennsylvania. Other than this, the chief value of his work lies in his cautious, concise, and dispassionate narration of many interesting events in the history of colonial Maryland.

The first lecture tells of George Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore — his education, his service to King James I., his conversion to the Roman Catholic faith, his unsuccessful attempt to found Avalon, his successful application for the Maryland charter, closing with an estimate of his usefulness and true worth. The second and third lectures are devoted to an account of the administration of the government during the proprietorship of Cecilius, second Lord Baltimore. In them the author

enumerates the lord proprietor's powers and Cecilius's first instructions, tells of his troubles, discusses the steps taken for the promotion of religious toleration, and gives the judgment of each of several writers on Cecilius's character. The fourth lecture continues the narrative under the administration of Charles, third Lord Baltimore; and from the way in which Charles contended with his difficulties the author passes judgment on his personality, which is pronounced inferior to that of his father. The next lecture tells of the conversion of Benedict Leonard, fourth Lord Baltimore, to the Protestant faith, and the consequent restoration of the proprietary government six weeks before his death. Then we are given glimpses of the disrepute in which the last two Lords Baltimore — Charles and Frederick — were held in England, and told of the surprising ignorance through which the former was defrauded by the Penns, and how the latter, convicted at the bar of public opinion of an infamous crime, cared nothing for Maryland except as a source of revenue. The sixth and last lecture portrays the manners and customs, the social and economic life of the entire colonial period.

As a contribution to historical literature the value of these lectures might have been much increased had the author made only the personalities of the Lords Baltimore the ever-central object of his study, dwelt only on such events as the lord proprietor for the time being was directly responsible for, sought the motive of his action in every such case, and so enabled himself to give us more penetrating views of these men. Instead of this, it is clear that he had two points of view — at one time the personality of a lord proprietor, at another the mere progress of events — and has shown us only a loose general relation between the two.

NEWTON D. MERENESS.

Prince Charles Edward Stuart, the Young Chevalier. By Andrew Lang. (London, New York, and Bombay, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1903, pp. xii, 476.) We are much indebted to Messrs. Longmans, Green, and Company for putting within the reach of the ordinary reader another of the magnificent Goupil series of illustrated biographies, which so happily combine artistic bookmanship and scholarly excellence. In 1875 Mr. A. C. Ewald published his exhaustive two-volume work, *The Life and Times of Prince Charles Stuart*, based largely on the state papers in the Record Office, and on such of the *Stuart Papers* as were then in print. While he added not a little to our knowledge on the subject, it was thought, even at the time, that there was still room for a future work in the same field. Mr. Lang in undertaking the task has had the advantage of access to material hitherto unused, notably the whole correspondence covering the years 1720 to 1786, and other manuscripts, now at Windsor Castle, of the exiled house of Stuart. In addition to other new sources of information the author has been assisted by his studies in preparation for *Pickle the Spy* and *The Companions of Pickle*.

The work now before us is a biography in the most restricted sense: larger issues, international intrigues, conditions in England, Scotland,

and France, and the whole tangle of political, social, and religious considerations which contributed so much to determine the fate of the movement centering in the years 1745-1746 have not been altogether neglected; but they have been distinctly subordinated in order that the main emphasis might be laid on the personal life and adventures of Charles. Doubtless this method of treatment is justified, both from the requirements of the series and from the fact that the public aspects of the question are those best known. Still Mr. Lang's besetting fault is a bit too much in evidence; of overcrowding his pages with detail and frequently confusing the reader with discussions of minute points. However, the narrative is vigorous and dramatic and tells us much that we have wanted to know of the prince and his adherents; of the dissensions among the clans and among the generals during the invasion; of Charles's wanderings through the Hebrides from April to December of 1746; and particularly of the obscure period after the prince left Avignon in 1749. By the publication of a proclamation dated 1759 we are enabled to have Charles's own account of the reasons for his conversion to Protestantism in 1750. In this volume is brought out, more convincingly than ever before, the steady degeneracy of the prince, how after a period "first of gallant adventure, then of darkling conspiracy, then of ruin," he became "a poor, despised, forsaken, unacknowledged, exiled king." His character broke down under the irony of circumstances and from too much cherishing of an impracticable ambition. After the failure of his great effort he came to distrust every one, and instead of returning to a dignified though renowned position in Rome, he spent his best years "in a life of lurking, where his active spirit and body were first devoured by indolence, and then ruined by the desperate resource familiar to extreme poverty and extreme despair." In conclusion it is pleasant to note Mr. Lang's opinion that the characters of James and the cardinal gain rather than lose by study.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

Les Combattants Français de la Guerre Américaine, 1778-1783. Listes établies d'après les documents authentiques déposés aux Archives Nationales et aux Archives du Ministère de la Guerre. Publiées par les soins du Ministère des Affaires Etrangères. (Paris, Ancienne Maison Quantin, 1903, pp. xii, 327.) Through the active efforts of the National Society Sons of the American Revolution and the sympathetic offices of the French government this exhaustive list of the French sailors and soldiers who assisted the American forces in the Revolution is made possible. It is a rather sumptuous volume in folio, and garnished with some ten full-page portraits and other illustrations, which, however, are not listed in the table of contents. It might be too much to expect an index of names, but it would have been very useful, and that is the quality for which society publications of this kind may most deserve our gratitude. There is a short historical introduction by M. Henri Mèrou, French consul at Chicago, at whose initiative the work was undertaken. An edition of

eight hundred copies has been published, of which two hundred and seventy-five have been placed at the disposal of the United States Department of State.

B. A. F.

Mémoire sur ma Détention au Temple, 1797-1799. Par P.-Fr. de Rémusat. Publié pour la Société d'Histoire Contemporaine, avec introduction, notes et documents inédits, par Victor Pierre. (Paris, Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1903, pp. xlii, 191.) This volume is the fourth by M. Pierre in the same field of history. Two, *18 Fructidor* and *La Déportation Ecclésiastique sous le Directoire*, published by the Société d'Histoire Contemporaine in 1893 and 1896, were preceded in 1887 by a work on the terror under the Directory. Of the present volume the central figure, Pierre François de Rémusat, is little known and, save as a victim of the Directory, not of interest to history. Born at Marseilles in 1755, he availed himself of commercial interests in the Levant to spend the stormier years of the Revolution, under passport, in Smyrna and Italy. On his return to France in 1796, he was elected to the Five Hundred for the Bouches-du-Rhône. This election, with others, was annulled arbitrarily after the 18 Fructidor (September 4, 1797), and Rémusat himself, arrested in October, 1797, was through Merlin de Douai detained groundlessly in the Temple, as a conspirator and émigré, until the latter's fall on the 30 Prairial (June 18, 1799). Rémusat thus barely escaped execution only to die in 1803 of a disease contracted during this imprisonment. The memoir, with a list of his fellow-prisoners—amongst them was Admiral Sir William Sidney Smith—he wrote within two months after his release. It has literary merit, and as a record of the events of which it treats it is unique in its fullness, accurate, and singularly free of rancor. At one point Merlin de Douai is called a cannibal. This epithet, applied to one who had sought Rémusat's life, is mild enough in a manuscript that was never designed for the public. Only fourteen years after Rémusat's death his brother published the memoir, preceded, in a single volume, by a quantity of indifferent verse, to the writing of which Rémusat, despite his commercial origin, was slightly addicted. As a result of this order, although by several critics the superior merit of the memoir was recognized at once, the volume, in the catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale, is entombed with the poets. Copies of the original edition are rare. By this reprint, with a suitable introduction and an appendix of hitherto unpublished documents relating to Rémusat, M. Pierre has practically restored to publicity a valuable, interesting, forgotten work.

H. M. BOWMAN.

Some account of the commemorative proceedings held on Marshall Day, 1901, in the various states of the Union, and the addresses given in honor of John Marshall have been published in three substantial volumes, the main title of which is *John Marshall, Life, Character, and Judicial Services*. (Chicago, Callaghan and Company, 1903.) Included with the centennial addresses are the orations of Binney, Story, Phelps, Waite, and Rawle. Especially noteworthy is the introduction by John

F. Dillon, in which certain vexed legal questions of peculiar interest to historical students are considered. Mr. Dillon holds that the method followed by Marshall in giving the decision in *Marbury vs. Madison* was entirely regular and satisfactory, that the chief-justice would not have been justified in declaring that the court had no jurisdiction because of the unconstitutionality of a clause of the Judiciary Act, until other aspects of the case before the court had been considered, inasmuch as it is improper to declare an act of the legislative void unless the necessity is absolutely imperative; that is to say, unless there is no other ground on which a decision of the case can be placed. The course of Marshall in issuing a subpoena to President Jefferson is also upheld. "‘No such divinity doth hedge’ the President," says Mr. Dillon, "that by virtue of his office he is, in criminal cases, totally exempt from judicial process requiring his attendance as a witness" (I. xxxvii). Professor Thayer in his address, also here published, presents different views (I. 232).

Moses Greenleaf, Maine's First Mapmaker. A Biography: with Letters, Unpublished Manuscripts, and a Reprint of Mr. Greenleaf's rare Paper on Indian Place-Names. Also a Bibliography of the Maps of Maine. Edited by Edgar Crosby Smith. (Bangor, printed for the De Burians, 1902, pp. xxiii, 163.) The scope of this book is well expressed in its title. It is a monograph, elaborated with loving minuteness and some of the exaggeration inevitable with a local biographer, of the life and work of a man highly deserving of honor in his own state, though hardly known beyond its limits. Moses Greenleaf was born in Massachusetts in 1777, removed to the District of Maine in 1790, settled at Williamsburg in 1810, and devoted the remainder of an industrious life to the advancement of the interests of Maine, chiefly through the collection and publication of statistical and geographical information about the state. He was a fine example of the pioneering squire found always on the advancing margin of Anglo-Saxon civilization, with the strong individuality, public spirit, and faith in his country characteristic of such men. Under great disadvantages he produced his two books, *Statistical View of the District of Maine* (1816), and *Survey of the State of Maine* (1829), together with his remarkable map of 1815 and others of later date. These various works, compiled with the greatest care and all possible completeness, supplied information hitherto wanting or inaccessible about the state and its resources, thus contributing greatly to its development, and they are of fundamental importance to the historian and geographer of Maine.

The interest of the volume under review will of course be chiefly local. To the student outside of the state it will have some value for its accurate synopses of Greenleaf's not very common books, for the account of his important map of 1815, and for the "Bibliography" of maps of Maine. The latter, while no doubt the most elaborate list hitherto published, is very far from complete. The period from 1610 to 1744 is a complete blank, although numerous important maps of that time belong within the scope of the list, which suffers, furthermore, from its monot-

onous typography and consequent difficulty of reference. The letters and unpublished manuscripts mentioned in the title are purely personal records of Mr. Greenleaf's life, and the paper on place-names, while of some antiquarian, is of slight philological interest.

The volume is pleasing in appearance, tasteful though not immaculate in typography, and appropriately illustrated. It is the second of a series issued by a club of book-lovers, one of whose objects is to commemorate worthy men of the state. For a local society certainly no object could be more commendable.

W. F. GANONG.

Mazzini, by Bolton King (London, J. M. Dent and Company; New York, E. P. Dutton and Company, 1902, pp. xxiii, 380), is the first volume of the Temple Biographies, practically a new series, edited by Dugald Macfadyen. The editor states in his preface that the object of the series is to "bring together studies in the lives of men who have, by common consent, achieved the greatness which belongs to character rather than to status or circumstance" (p. vii), or again, "lives which have this double aspect; on one side commanding interest for the service which they have rendered to their kind, and on the other respect for their achievement of character" (p. xi). Certainly Mr. King has set a high standard (for a series), and if the editor is as happy in fitting author to subject in the succeeding numbers, the enterprise will be successful in a marked degree. Mr. King is undoubtedly the first of English scholars in knowledge of nineteenth-century Italian history; and in the present volume there is exhibited the wide information, exactness in detail, and carefulness of judgment for which his *History of Italian Unity* has prepared us. To these qualities may be added a judicious sympathy that leaves the reader with a more intimate sense of the man and his work than follows the reading of any other book in English on Mazzini. It is, however, scant praise to say that Mr. King's life of Mazzini is the best one in English; apart from any comparison, it is an excellent work in itself. Something over half the book (222 pp.) has been devoted to a careful and interesting chronological account of Mazzini's life. The rest of the book is devoted to a systematic elucidation of Mazzini's thought as exhibited in his writings, together with a bibliography of those writings, and a final chapter containing a general estimate of Mazzini as a man. The discussion of Mazzini's thought is divided into chapters dealing with Religion, Duty, The State, Social Theories, Nationality, and Literary Criticism. There is a certain artistic loss, though perhaps a practical gain, in thus separating the active life of a man from his thought; and we doubt whether the result justifies the author in adopting this plan. It might also be suggested that Mr. King has assumed a greater familiarity with general Italian history than his readers will be found to possess. He is at little pains to outline the historical background; and the book can be satisfactorily used by the general reader only in the light of the author's *History of Italian Unity*. The index is poor. Yet these are small matters. The work is on the whole excellent. From the book-

lover's standpoint the series will do credit to the publishers, no small part of which credit, if we can judge from the present volume, will be due to the character of the illustrations that are to accompany it.

CARL BECKER.

Life of Rear Admiral John Randolph Tucker. By Captain James Henry Rochelle. (Washington, The Neale Publishing Company, 1903, pp. 112.) This brief account of the life of Rear-Admiral John Randolph Tucker, written by his official subordinate, comrade, and friend, Captain Rochelle, is a tribute of loyalty and affection. Appointed a midshipman from Virginia in 1826, when fourteen years old; resigning when a commander thirty-five years later, upon the outbreak of the Civil War, to become a commander in the Confederate navy, and eventually reaching the grade of flag-officer in that service, then to serve as rear-admiral in the Peruvian navy during the short war with Spain—this in briefest outline is the naval story of Admiral Tucker's life, a sort of track-chart of his wide sea-wanderings.

In the Mexican War he served in the bomb-brig *Stromboli*, commanding that vessel during the latter part of the war, and took part in the capture of Tobasco and in various other naval operations. In the Civil War he commanded the Confederate gunboat *Patrick Henry* and took part in the first engagement between the *Merrimac* and the ships and batteries at Hampton Roads. When the Confederate vessels in James River were dismantled and abandoned, their crews and guns were utilized at Drewry's Bluff, where they successfully resisted the efforts of the Union vessels to ascend the river. After this Commander Tucker was given command of the iron-clad steamer *Chicora* at Charleston. This vessel and her sister ship, the *Palmetto State*, made a successful attack upon the wooden squadron then blockading Charleston and caused a brief interruption of the blockade, but the low speed of these two vessels prevented them from being a serious menace to the investing fleet.

It is interesting to read that when serving in the Peruvian navy he strongly urged the allied governments of Peru and Chili to despatch an expedition against Manila, the far-away and ill-defended outpost of Spain, pointing out how easily success might be achieved and how great its probable consequences.

Upon leaving the naval service of Peru he performed adventurous and valuable service in exploring the upper Amazon, securing data for its more perfect charting, and thus marking out a practicable route for Peruvian commerce to follow from the Andes down the river to the sea. This service done, he returned to his home in Virginia, and there, after a few peaceful years, he died in 1883.

The written story of his life contains nothing of a controversial nature, adds little to general history, and is chiefly valuable to his family and friends as the memorial of a noble man and gallant officer, one of the many unfortunate but not undeserving whose lives were saddened by a divided duty when the call to arms was heard in 1861.

Contemporary France. By Gabriel Hanotaux. Translated by John Charles Tarver. Vol. I. 1870-1873. (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1903, pp. xv, 696.) This volume might well have had for a subtitle "Thiers," since it is so completely, and very justly, occupied with the deeds of the first president of the republic for the years which it covers. Thiers is not merely the most notable, but almost the only statesman to be taken into account in writing the history of the establishment of the Third Republic, the liberation of the territory from German troops, and the devising of means for raising and paying the enormous war-indemnity. The author, moreover, for many reasons possesses exceptional qualifications for writing the history of contemporary France; but more particularly because his experience as an exceptionally successful minister for foreign affairs has given him a knowledge of government and politics that is often quite valuable in threading one's way through the mazes of current events.

Although nominally dealing with the period from September 4, 1870, to May 24, 1873, the volume becomes of real service to the student only from February, 1871. The overthrow of the Empire, the siege of Paris, the provisional government—subjects all of the first importance as affecting subsequent events—are discussed rather than narrated or explained; so for this part of the book the reader needs to possess a considerable previous knowledge. But for the two and a fourth years really and adequately treated, the narrative is full and generally satisfactory. It is, however, largely narrative, with no considerable attempt at broad and illuminating generalization, for which the author demonstrates his capacity in the first chapter.

In view of the fullness of detail with which M. Hanotaux has treated these two eventful years, it seems almost petty to offer a minor criticism; and yet the student of economic history cannot help lamenting the absence of a careful explanation of the method by which the five milliards were transferred from France to Germany, and of the relation which this unprecedented monetary transaction bore to the financial crisis of 1873. But this is a small matter as compared with the value of the book as a whole. Other leading topics, besides the liberation of the territory and the payment of the indemnity, are the reorganization of the army and the first steps towards the establishment of a republican form of government; in all these undertakings Thiers proved himself indispensable to France, as Hanotaux easily shows. Vivid pen-pictures of Thiers and other prominent men of the period add materially to the interest and value of the book.

The total impression of this volume is that the author has added not a little to our stock of information, but he has written a light, popular, almost journalistic book, and not a scholarly work. On this account it is especially unfortunate that the translation should be so crude; on almost every page one is painfully aware that it is a translation. French words, phases, constructions, and paragraphing confront one at every step—not in the original French, to be sure, but in a strict literalness

of translation betokening hasty and apparently unrevised work, together with a carelessness of proof-reading that adds to the discomforts otherwise sufficiently abundant.

CHARLES F. A. CURRIER.

The Making of Our Middle Schools. By Elmer Ellsworth Brown. (New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1903, pp. xii, 547.) This book is not so much the work of a man intent only upon writing a record, as of one seeking also practical leadings. However, in this case at least, the history is not the worse from the writer's anxious lookout for meanings and lessons.

Beginning, as properly he must, with the grammar-schools of Old England at the time of the Renaissance, Dr. Brown goes on to a succinct but sufficient and lifelike picture of our earlier and later colonial grammar-schools and the school systems of which these were a part, as well as of the masters and "scholars" and studies that made up the schools. In a number of chapters he then describes the next phase and period of our secondary educational history, that of the academies. Here again, however, he rightly goes back to the mother-country for his beginnings, yet brings out with admirable clearness how completely characteristic a product the American academy was, with its provincialities of practicality, patriotism, and eloquence, and with — what is of more moment — the unhampered informality of its founding, involving, as it did, a minimum of governmental intervention and a maximum of private initiative. In its homely, wholesome, steady regard to the broader, genuinely popular need in education, it was an expression not simply of American rawness, but of the American genius of individualism, and the rising tide of American democracy. Having followed the academy through its dominance from the period of the Revolution clear down to the Civil War, the writer goes back to trace the movement toward public control from its sporadic beginnings down to its overshadowing triumph in the present-day public high school. The attempt is made to disclose the reasons for the rise of the latter, to catch its enforming spirit, and to disentangle the threads of its complex growth and tendency at the present hour. The author in no wise forgets, however, to keep record right along of all the accompanying special developments — all manner of private, denominational, military, technical, and other schools — so that his presentation may be complete, and the estimate and outlook with which he closes may have a soundly objective and reasoned basis.

This book, without any impairment of its scientific character, introduces us to the ethos and human quality of the epochs it portrays. It possesses likewise some distinct philosophic sense, and is capable of the forward as truly as the backward look. The student seeking acquaintance with the genesis and the genius of our American secondary education will find here a valuable guidebook.

GEORGE REBEC.

History and Civil Government of Louisiana. By John R. Ficklen, B.Let., Professor in Tulane University. (Chicago and New York, Werner School Book Company, 1901, pp. iii, 383.) Two qualifications

are necessary for the successful compilation of elementary books of history — familiarity with the subject, and a power of clear exposition. These are both possessed by the writer of the book under review. The labors of Professor J. R. Ficklen in the field of Louisiana history date from his election to a professorship in the old Louisiana University, and have been kept up unremittingly to the present. So far as the history of a state for two hundred years can be given in one hundred and fifty pages, the work is eminently satisfactory. The main difficulty was in the proportional treatment of the details, and this difficulty has been successfully met. The history of Louisiana offers little opportunity for novelty of treatment. The originality of the work lies in the clear statement of the civil government, which is the best existing summary of the conditions prevailing in the state to-day. Such a book should have been supplied with an index. The heading "title-index with questions" on the last two pages, is misleading. On the whole the book is to be recommended highly to small libraries as a fair and trustworthy history of the romantic development of Louisiana from colony to state, and of its evolution through the less varied but not less important events of the nineteenth century.

WILLIAM BEER.

Centralizing Tendencies in the Administration of Indiana. By William A. Rawles, Ph.D. [Columbia Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, Vol. XVII., No. 1.] (New York, The Columbia University Press, The Macmillan Company, 1903, pp. 336.) In the above monograph Professor Rawles has shown the tendency towards centralization in the various departments of state activity in Indiana. The monograph embraces a study of state administration in connection with education, charities and correction, medicine and hygiene, taxation, and police power. The author has made a careful study of the laws of the state and territory, and has noted the various steps by which the present centralization in administration has been effected. He has established two points: first, that the tendency in the state administration has been strongly towards centralization; and second, that this centralization has resulted in economy and efficiency. The work has been done with thoroughness and good judgment. The evidence has been carefully weighed, and the conclusions are conservative and tenable.

It is interesting to note in this connection that other writers in the series to which this volume belongs have noted similar tendencies in other states. It is to be hoped that additional studies of the same character will proceed from the department of political science of Columbia, as it is only by such monographs as these that comprehensive treatises are made possible.

T. F. MORAN.

Puerto Rico has long enjoyed the happiness of having no history, and the effort to supply the lack in the "Expansion of the Republic" series (*History of Puerto Rico*, by R. A. van Middeldyk, edited by Martin G. Brumbaugh, New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1903, pp. xvii, 318) will not seriously contribute to a disturbance of its former

condition. Mr. van Middeldyk is the librarian of the free public library at San Juan, and from the material there accessible he has compiled a summary of the island's annals, from which the reader may derive a good idea of the conditions under which it alternately developed and stagnated during the past four hundred years. The author's knowledge of Spanish seems to be quite as complete as is his command of English, and his style and vocabulary leave no doubt that neither is his native tongue.

G. P. W.

Volume XVI., New Series, of the *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* contains the papers read before the society at its monthly meetings from November, 1901, to June, 1902. Dr. G. W. Prothero's presidential address is notable for discriminating though brief estimates of five distinguished historians recently deceased — Bishop Creighton, Bishop Stubbs, Lord Acton, Dr. S. R. Gardiner, and Mr. R. C. Christie, and also for a résumé of the activity of the society during the year in question, particularly in connection with the establishment of a school of historical research in London. Partly through their efforts an initial step in this direction has been taken by the foundation of two lecture-ships, one in paleography, diplomatics, and historical sources, the other in historical method. In his paper on "Some Materials for a new Edition of Polydore Vergil's History" Father Gasquet describes a manuscript in the Vatican archives, evidently the original draft of Polydore's first printed edition of 1534. The other contributions to the volume are: "The Internal Organization of the Merchant Adventurers of England," by W. E. Lingelbach; "The High Court of Admiralty in Relation to National History, Commerce, and the Colonization of America — A. D. 1550-1650," by R. G. Marsden; "The State Papers of the Early Stuarts and the Interregnum," by Mrs. S. C. Lomas; "An Unknown Conspiracy against Henry VII.," by I. S. Leadam; and "The Social Condition of England during the Wars of the Roses," by V. B. Redstone.

NOTES AND NEWS

As was stated in the July number of the *REVIEW*, the office of the managing editor is henceforth to be in Washington, D. C. Correspondence should be addressed in care of Carnegie Institution.

The Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association will be held, in conjunction with the American Economic Association, at New Orleans, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, December 29, 30, and 31. The tentative programme includes, among other features, a session Tuesday morning on "The Mississippi Valley and the Southwest," with papers by Professors Sloane and Turner and Messrs. W. W. Howe, P. J. Hamilton, W. F. McCaleb and R. G. Thwaites; a session Wednesday morning on "The Study and Teaching of History in the South," with ten-minute addresses by Professors Bassett, Dodd, Garrison, Jameson, Salmon, and others; a session Wednesday afternoon on "European History," with papers by Professors Robinson, Fling, H. E. Bourne, Haskins, and probably Stephens; and a session Thursday morning on "American History," with papers by Professors Farrand, Ficklen, and Johnson, and probably Dean Wells of New Orleans. There is also a session on "Diplomatic History," planned for Wednesday evening; and two joint meetings, one Tuesday evening, when the annual president's addresses will be given, the other Thursday evening, when Professor Giddings will read a paper on "The Relation of Sociology to History and Economics." This subject is to be discussed afterward by four economists, and by Professors Hull of Cornell and West of Minnesota. Arrangements have been made by the local committee to receive the members of both associations as guests of two local clubs, and a special local committee has been appointed to confer with Miss Tarbell for the comfort and entertainment of ladies who may attend the meeting. After the session Thursday evening Tulane University will tender a large reception in its new library building. The railroads south of the Ohio and Potomac have already agreed to sell tickets on the certificate plan at the rate of a single fare plus twenty-five cents, and it is hoped that the other railroads will grant the same rate. Also the most reasonable terms have been secured for two special trains, from New York and Cincinnati respectively, by which it will be possible to combine the trip to New Orleans with a visit to other southern points of special interest. Sufficiently long stops will be made at the places visited, the entire trip will occupy nine days, and the return will be by a different route. However, final arrangements for these trains cannot be made unless a minimum of seventy-five passengers for each of them is secured, and all who may be interested in this plan should write immediately to Professor E. R. A. Seligman, 324 West 86th Street, New York City.

Frederick Law Olmsted, who died August 28 in his eighty-second year, was a man of most varied activities, although he is most generally known for his remarkable achievements in beautifying the landscape of many parts of our country. However, his observations during a horse-back trip through the south in the early fifties, published in *A Journey in the Seaboard States* (1856); *A Journey through Texas* (1857); *A Journey in the Back Country* (1860); and in the subsequent digest of all three, *The Cotton Kingdom* (1861), make him the leading authority to whom historical students must always refer for contemporaneous and first-hand accounts of the agricultural resources of the south on the eve of the Civil War, and for the effects of slavery in the agricultural system.

Colonel G. F. R. Henderson, who died at Assoun, Egypt, March 6, 1903, was favorably known to American students as the author of *A Tactical Study of Fredericksburg* and of *Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War*. For many years director of military art and history at the Staff College, Colonel Henderson had been since 1900 director of military intelligence in South Africa.

Professor Edward Channing of Harvard University is to devote his sabbatical year to his large history of the United States, the first volume of which, covering the period from 1660 to 1760, may be expected in 1904. During the second half-year of Professor Channing's leave of absence Professor Frederick J. Turner, of the University of Wisconsin, will work at Harvard.

Mr. Everette Kimball, assistant in history at Harvard University, goes to Wellesley for the forthcoming year to take charge of the work of Miss Elizabeth Kimball Kendall, who is to have a year's leave of absence.

In the absence of Professor Carl R. Fish, Professor James A. Woodburn, of the University of Indiana, will during the first semester give courses in American history at the University of Wisconsin.

The work at the University of Michigan of Professor A. C. McLaughlin, who is to spend the ensuing year at Washington, is to be undertaken by Dr. C. H. Van Tyne, formerly teaching fellow in the University of Pennsylvania. In addition, a series of lectures is to be given by Professors Hart, Jameson, Turner, and McLaughlin.

Professor Theodore C. Smith has resigned his position at the Ohio State University to accept a professorship in Williams College.

Dr. G. T. Lapsley, recently of the University of California, has become assistant professor in the University of Pennsylvania.

The numerous contributions by Lord Macaulay to the *Edinburgh Review* supply the contents of three volumes lately issued by Messrs. Methuen (London): *Critical and Historical Essays*, edited, with introduction, notes, and index, by F. C. Montague.

Messrs. Calmann-Lévy (Paris) announce a "Nouvelle Collection Historique" at four francs the volume, and begin it with *Choiseul à Rome*, by Maurice Boutry; a series of hitherto unpublished letters and memoirs

applying to the years 1754-1757 and relating to a subject lately of special interest, the conclave.

The remarkable work of Professor Friedrich Ratzel on *Politische Geographie*, with thirty-nine maps, has been published in a second and revised edition (Munich, Oldenbourg).

The Bibliographer, which was edited through the first four numbers by Mr. Paul Leicester Ford and after his tragic death well kept up by Miss Caroline Shipman, suspended publication with the June number. It is regrettable that Messrs. Dodd, Mead, and Co. could not find sufficient support for this enterprise.

Professor Richard T. Ely in his *Studies in the Evolution of Industrial Society* treats in part of the different stages in the progress of society from what is supposed to be the earliest savage state. The major portion deals with some special problems of industrial evolution, such as competition, monopolies and trusts, inheritance of property, municipal ownership. The book is one of "The Citizen's Library", published by The Macmillan Company.

Another large history on the coöperative plan has been undertaken, this time in Germany: *Handbuch der Mittelalterlichen und neueren Geschichte*, edited by two well-known scholars, G. von Below and F. Meinecke. The prospectus exhibits a plan by which medieval and modern European history will be treated in forty-two volumes, distributed as follows: "Allgemeines", eight; "Politische Geschichte", nine; "Verfassung, Recht, Wirtschaft", sixteen; "Hilfswissenschaften und Altertümer", nine. Also simultaneously with the announcement of the entire collection, one of its volumes—the last in the plan—has been published: *Das häusliche Leben der europäischen Kulturvölker vom Mittelalter bis zur zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts*, by Alwin Schultz, of the German University of Prague. The publisher is R. Oldenbourg, Munich.

The translation of Seignobos's *Feudal Régime* having been favorably received, Messrs. Henry Holt and Company have decided to make it the first number of a series of similar publications, to be called "Historical Readings" and to be edited by Earle W. Dow. The series is designed to provide, in a form that may be convenient especially for use in classes, good short treatments of important subjects in history, and suitable collections of sources. The second number, ready this fall, is an account, taken from Wilhelm Roscher's *Kolonien, Kolonialpolitik und Auswanderung*, of Spanish Colonization in America: *The Spanish Colonial System*, translation edited by Professor Edward G. Bourne.

By way of homage to M. Léopold Delisle, many persons on both sides of the Atlantic united in offering him, on the fiftieth anniversary of his service in the Bibliothèque Nationale, an exhaustive bibliography of his works: *Bibliographie des Travaux de M. Léopold Delisle* (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale), compiled by M. Paul Lacombe. The list comprises some 1889 titles. M. Delisle in turn, in appreciation of this

tribute, sent to each of its subscribers a beautiful *Fac-similé de Livres Copiés et Enluminés pour le Roi Charles V*, being reproductions, with explanatory text, of specimen pages from manuscripts in the library of Charles V. (Paris, privately printed).

For the convenience of students four sets of maps have been made up out of the Oxford *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe* and published separately: "Europe and her Colonies", "Great Britain", "Germany and Adjacent Countries", and "The Latin Nations." The first contains twenty-seven maps and is listed at 35 shillings; the others have twenty-two maps each, listed at 30 shillings.

The *Revue de Synthèse Historique* has begun a series of reports upon studies relating to the various regions of France. M. H. Berr writes the general introduction: "La Synthèse des Études Relatives aux Régions de la France", in the April number, and M. L. Barrau-Dihigo treats of "La Gascogne" in both the April and June numbers. Also, in the April number M. Henri See takes stock of the literature relating to the history of political ideas, with reference to "France (XVII^e et XVIII^e Siècles)".

Dr. J. B. Chabot, of Paris, has undertaken, with the aid of a group of other Catholic scholars, the publication of a *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, which will be a sort of complement to the Migne collection of Greek and Latin Christian writers. For the present at least only inedited texts will be published, and the editor charges himself with the Syriac texts.

It is announced that the letters of Lord Acton to Miss Mary Gladstone — now Mrs. Drew — are to be issued within a few months. They are said to be full of brilliant criticism, literary, historical, and political.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: K. Lamprecht, *Über den Begriff der Geschichte und über historische und psychologische Gesetze* (Annalen der Naturphilosophie, II. 2); Munroe Smith, *Customary Law*, I. (Political Science Quarterly, June); H. Delehay, *Les Légendes Hagiographiques* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July).

ANCIENT, AND EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

The latest addition to the "Story of the Nations" series gives a picture of ancient India drawn rather from Buddhistic than Brahman records: *Buddhist India*, by Professor Rhys-Davids (Putnams).

Frank Jesup Scott is the author of a monograph entitled *Portraits of Julius Cæsar* (New York, Longmans, 1903, pp. xii, 185). It contains, besides a sketch of Cæsar's life, thirty-seven plates and forty-nine other portrait engravings. Each statue or other representation of Cæsar is appropriately considered in the text.

An elementary source-book for Roman history, prepared by G. W. and Lillie Shaw Botsford, was published recently by The Macmillan Company: *The Story of Rome as Greeks and Romans Tell It*.

The Richard Crawley translation of Thucydides's *Peloponnesian War* has lately found a place in the "Temple Classics," in two volumes (The Macmillan Company). In the same collection has also appeared the Elizabethan translation by John Healey of Augustine's *City of God*, in three volumes.

Some translations of important works concerning the early church are in progress. The first volume of an English edition of the work of Professor Paul Wernle, of the University of Basel, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, has been issued by Williams and Norgate (London) under the subtitle "The Rise of the Religion." The second volume will deal with "The Development of the Church." The same house has in preparation English versions of E. von Dobschütz's *Die urchristlichen Gemeinden, Sittengeschichtliche Bilder* and Harnack's *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Revillout, *Un Prince Révolutionnaire dans l'Ancienne Égypte* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, July); C. Callewaert, *Le Délit de Christianisme dans les deux Premiers Siècles* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, July).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

The first part of *Lateinische Paläographie*, by F. Steffens, has now appeared. It embraces thirty-five plates, illustrating Latin writing down to Charles the Great (Freiburg, Switzerland, B. Veith). It may be added here that M. Prou is to have ready by the end of the year a new *Recueil de Fac-similés d'Écritures du V^e au XVII^e Siècle*, which will comprise fifty new plates containing sixty-three documents (Paris, Picard).

The house of Welter (Paris) announces a complete reproduction of the fifteenth-century manuscript known as the *Breviarium Grimani*. This manuscript, executed from 1478 to 1489, is most elaborately illuminated, as is known; and the reproduction promises to contain 1,568 quarto plates, 300 in colors and the rest in photo-heliogravure. The work will be sold by subscription, the instalments of which, by the end of publication in 1908 or 1910, will have amounted to 3,000 francs.

Two recent additions to "The Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago" are *Studies Concerning Adrian IV.*, by Professor Oliver J. Thatcher, and *The Decline of the Missi Dominici in Frankish Gaul*, by Dr. James Westfall Thompson (the University of Chicago Press, 1903).

The house of Picard et Fils is bringing out a considerable work on Poitou which will be of interest for the history of England as well as of France: *Histoire des Comtes de Poitou (778-1204)*, by A. Richard. The first of its two volumes is published, and applies to the years 778-1126.

Sir Henry Yule's *The Book of Ser Marco Polo, The Venetian* has now been issued in a third edition, fittingly revised by M. Henri Cordier, of Paris, and accompanied by a memoir of Henry Yule compiled by his daughter, Amy Frances Yule (Scribner).

The current number of the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (XXIV. 2) contains a third instalment of W. Goetz's review of the sources of the history of St. Francis: "Die Quellen zur Geschichte des hl. Franz. von Assisi, II. Die Legenden". It may be added here that two translations of *The Mirror of Perfection* have appeared lately; one by Constance, Countess de la Warr, with an introduction by Father Cuthbert (London, Burns and Oates), and one by Mr. John Steele, in Dent's "Temple Classics."

The Mediæval Stage, in two volumes, by E. K. Chambers, has been published by the Clarendon Press (New York, Henry Frowde, 1903, pp. xiii, 419; v, 480). Considerable portions will prove of interest to the student of the social life of the middle ages. The last 235 pages of Volume II. are given up to appendixes containing chiefly reprints of original documents.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Lucian Johnston, *Historians of the Mediæval Papacy* (Catholic University Bulletin, July); G. Caro, *Die Landgüter in den frankischen Formelsammlungen* (Historische Vierteljahrsschrift, August); C. Neumann, *Byzantische Kultur und Renaissancekultur* (Historische Zeitschrift, XCI. 2).

MODERN HISTORY.

We were in error at this place in the July number in announcing as published Mr. Pollard's volume on *Thomas Cranmer* for the "Heroes of the Reformation" series. It is not definitely known when it will be ready.

Announcement has been made of a new periodical devoted to the history of the Reformation: *Archiv für Reformations-Geschichte*, to be published, with the support of the Verein für Reformations-Geschichte, by Schwetschke und Sohn, Berlin, at the subscription price of about ten marks a year. It will contain documents, articles, notes and queries, and a current bibliography of publications relating to the Reformation. The editor is W. Friedensburg, director of archives at Stettin.

The second volume of Mr. Oman's *History of the Peninsular War* appeared in the summer. It covers the time from January to September, 1809, closing with the end of the Talavera campaign (Clarendon Press).

M. Gabriel Hanotaux has found time, when only the first volume of his *History of Contemporary France* is out, to put together his studies upon the question of harmony among the Latin peoples: *La Paix Latine*. The book purports to be a sort of synthesis of Mediterranean history and of the writer's impressions from journeys in Spain, Italy, Tunis, and the Adriatic (Paris, Combert et Cie.).

The Annual Register for 1902 (Longmans, 1903) contains the usual amount of valuable statement of political occurrences and of other important events. The whole constitutes an excellent summary of the year, with special reference, of course, to Great Britain. Unfortunately, only 36 pages out of a total of 476 are given to the history of the western

hemisphere. The publishers state that all of the volumes of the series from 1863 to 1901 may be purchased. They form a most valuable record of the last forty years.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Jordan, *Niccolò Machiavelli und Katharina von Medici* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, August); M. A. Tucker, *Gian Matteo Giberti, Papal Politician and Catholic Reformer*, Part III. (English Historical Review, July); A Rébelliau, *Un Episode de l'Histoire Religieuse du XVII^e Siècle.—II. La Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement et la Contre-Réformation Catholique* (Revue des Deux Mondes, July 1, August 1); P. Muret, *Les Papiers de l'Abbé Béliardi et les Relations Commerciales de la France et de l'Espagne au Milieu du XVIII^e Siècle, 1757-1770* (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, July); A. Bourguet, *Le Duc de Choiseul et la Hollande*, concluded (Revue Historique, July); A. Sorel, *De Boulogne à Austerlitz.—I. La Coalition* (Revue des Deux Mondes, August 15).

GREAT BRITAIN.

The Royal Historical Society has commemorated the close association with its body of Bishop Stubbs, Bishop Creighton, Dr. Gardiner, and Lord Acton, by having prepared a minute bibliography of their respective writings. Besides being a complete record of their literary activity, it will doubtless be of special advantage to many students for its indication of the authorship of innumerable reviews. The arduous work of compiling the several lists was done chiefly by Dr. W. A. Shaw.

The latest addition to Appleton's series of Twentieth Century Text-Books is *The British Nation, A History*, by Professor George M. Wrong, of Toronto. The volume is generously and admirably illustrated, having, besides genealogical tables, six full-page maps, seventeen maps and plans in the text, and as many as 291 pictures, a large number of which are intended to teach industrial and social conditions.

Lingard's *History of England*, newly abridged and brought down to the accession of Edward VII. by Dom Henry Nobert Birt, with a preface by Abbot Gasquet, is among the late publications of Messrs. Bell and Sons (London). The work in this form is primarily intended for the use of schools.

The first number of *The Scottish Historical Review*—really a continuation and enlargement of the well-known *Scottish Antiquary*—is announced for October. It will endeavor "to cover the wide field of History, Archæology, and Literature with more particular reference to Scotland and the Borders, and with a special regard to the many common features of British national and social evolution" (quarterly, at 10 shillings; Glasgow, James Maclehose and Sons).

Among recent publications of documents is one of considerable interest which gives the earliest existing "Pipe Roll" of the bishopric of Winchester, or "Rent Roll" of the episcopal manors, thirty-seven in number, in six southern counties, for the fiscal year 1207-1208. It

was transcribed and extended, and supplied with an introduction, glossary, and indexes, by students of the London School of Economics, under the direction of their lecturer on paleography, Mr. Hubert Hall (sold by the director of the school).

Thomas of Eccleston's "De Adventu F. F. Minorum in Angliam" has been done into English under the title *The Friars, and how They Came to England*, with an introductory essay on the spirit and genius of the Franciscans by Father Cuthbert (London, Sands).

The Bampton Lectures for 1903, delivered by the Reverend W. H. Hutton, have been published by W. Gardner, London: *Influence of Christianity upon National Character*, illustrated by lives and legends of English Saints.

The Internal Organization of the Merchant Adventurers of England. By William E. Lingelbach, Ph.D. (Philadelphia, 1903, pp. 56.) This work, originally published as a thesis "in partial fulfillment for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy" at the University of Pennsylvania, and since reprinted in the *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, New Series, Vol. XVI., pp. 19-67, first suggested the volume on the *Sources* relating to Merchant Adventurers, already noticed in the REVIEW. It is not a history of the society, but rather an exposition of the "character and form of the organization of the Merchant Adventurers as it existed during the latter half of the sixteenth and earlier part of the seventeenth centuries." Based almost exclusively on original material, this careful and scholarly study furnishes much new and valuable information on the influence of the society as a factor in English history, on the character and qualifications of its membership, and on its form of government. Dr. Lingelbach brings out more clearly here than in the historical introduction to his collection of *Reprints* the nature and importance of his contribution on the seat of government of the company: that it was located abroad, and not in London.

The Royal Authority and the English Universities. By James F. Willard, Ph.D. (Philadelphia, 1902, pp. 89.) This study, prepared as a thesis for the University of Pennsylvania doctorate, traces in careful detail and with copious references to the sources the influence of the Crown in furthering the growth and independence of the universities of Oxford and Cambridge during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Among the topics treated are: the development of the judicial powers of the chancellors; the gradual encroachment of the universities on borough privileges; and the relation of the two institutions to the central government, with particular reference to exemption from jurisdiction and taxation. There are two appendixes, one dealing with the poll-tax of the second year of Richard II., the other illustrative of troubles between students and town. The bibliography containing a list of the titles referred to in the text is helpful, but there is no index.

E. P. Dutton and Company are publishers in this country of "An English Garner", a reissue in twelve volumes with slight alterations of

Professor Arber's *English Garner* (London, 1877-1890). New introductions have been written and the material has been rearranged and classified. We have already noticed the appearance of *Tudor Tracts, 1532-1588*, with introduction by A. F. Pollard; *Stuart Tracts, 1603-1693*, with introduction by C. H. Firth; and *Voyages and Travels, mainly during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, two volumes, edited by C. Raymond Beazley. In addition to these have recently appeared *Social England Illustrated*, a collection of seventeenth-century tracts, with an introduction by Andrew Lang; *Fifteenth Century Prose and Verse*, with an introduction and glossary by Alfred W. Pollard; *Critical Essays and Literary Fragments*, with an introduction by J. Churton Collins.

An important contribution to English history is made in a recent work by Mr. John Pollock: *The Popish Plot*, a study in the reign of Charles II. (London, Duckworth).

The Clarendon Press has in hand an edition of the *Letters of Horace Walpole*, prepared by Mrs. Paget Toynbee. Of the sixteen volumes which it will comprise, four are promised for November. There are to be many corrections as compared with previous editions, and a hundred or more letters that have not been printed before.

A Life of Charles James Fox, written by J. LeB. Hammond, was issued in the early summer by Messrs. Methuen, London. A political study of Fox and of the situation and problems of his day, it devotes attention chiefly to his part in the transformation of English parties, to his attitude on social and international questions, his struggle with the king, his views on parliamentary reform, religious toleration, and Pitt's régime of coercion, and particularly to his influence on the modern development of nationalism and democracy.

The Orrery Papers, 2 vols., edited by the Countess of Cork and Orrery, relate chiefly to John Boyle, fifth Earl of Orrery, and incidentally contain much information on the social conditions of England and Ireland in the early eighteenth century (London, Duckworth and Co.).

David Hume and his Influence on Philosophy and Theology, by Professor James Orr, of Glasgow, contains an interesting account of Hume's life and has something to say of his work as an historian and of the characteristics of his history (imported by Scribner, 1903).

It is announced that Lord Wolseley has now completed his long-expected memoirs and that they are to be published this fall, through Messrs. Constable, under the title *The Story of a Soldier's Life*.

Messrs. H. Sotheran, London, announce a five-volume work on *The County of Suffolk*: its history as disclosed by existing records and other documents, being materials for the history of Suffolk. The compiler, Dr. Coppinger, of Hain's *Supplement* reputation, has aimed "to give the substance of everything relating to the county of an historical or official character."

Doubtless many historical students will be interested in two recent works relating to the book-trade bibliography in England: one an essay on the beginnings of such bibliography since the introduction of printing, and in England since 1595; *Three Centuries of English Book-trade Bibliography*, by A. Growoll; the other, *A List of the Catalogues, etc., Published for the English Book-trade from 1595-1902*, by Wilberforce Eames (New York, M. L. Greenhalgh).

The account of the coronation of Edward VII., which Mr. J. E. C. Bodley was commissioned by the King to write, proves to be a book of wide interest. Besides giving a description and a detailed historical study of the coronation, it deals with the subject in connection with European and British imperial history: *The Coronation of Edward the Seventh: A Chapter of European and Imperial History* (London, Methuen). Mr. Bodley has now returned to the work with which he has been chiefly occupied for the past five years, a book on the church and religious questions in France.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. T. Winchester, *John Wesley* (Century, July and August); Lord North, *Lord North, the Prime Minister: a Personal Memoir*, II (North American Review, August).

FRANCE.

It seems probable that the twenty-fourth volume of the *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France*, which is announced to appear shortly, will be the last of the folio series of this collection. Meanwhile the Academy proceeds with the new quarto series, in which it has the coöperation of distinguished scholars that are not Academicians, like MM. Langlois and Molinier. This now includes four volumes.

The past summer witnessed the publication of an inventory which should render much service to students of French history: *État Général par Fonds des Archives Départementales*, for the ancient régime and the Revolutionary period. Among other things it contains a long table which purports to indicate what particular documents may be found in this or that departmental depot on all different subjects, such as an institution, a family, or a town. It applies even to series for which there is no special published inventory, and also to those which are only classified (Paris, Picard).

The 147th fascicle of the *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes* is devoted to a group of studies by M. Ferdinand Lot on France in the late tenth century: "Études sur le Règne de Hugues Capet et la Fin du X^e Siècle." It is understood that an early number of this collection will contain an elaborate study of the Northman invasions in France, by Mr. A. W. Kirkaldy, now of the University of Birmingham.

The new edition of the *Mémoires de Philippe de Commines* prepared by M. B. Mandrot for the Picard "Collection des Textes" is now complete, with the publication of the second volume (1477-1498).

Some important papers relating to the Orleans family, notably to Philippe Égalité, have recently come into the possession of the Institute, bequeathed by the Count Beugnot, who had inherited them from his father, the historian, and his grandfather, minister under the Restoration. They were seized from the Duke of Orleans in part at the time of his arrest in 1793 and in part before his execution.

The first volume of a second and entirely revised edition of M. E. Levasseur's *Histoire des Classes Ouvrières et de l'Industrie en France de 1789 à 1870* appeared in the early summer. This is in continuation of the same writer's well-known work on the period preceding the Revolution (Paris, Rousseau).

French revolutionary literature has received an interesting addition in *Paris in '48: Letters from a Resident Describing the Events of the Revolution*, by Baroness Bonde, edited by C. E. Warr. The writer of these letters lived some thirty years in Paris and was intimately acquainted with the diplomatic circle (London, Murray).

The correspondence of Thiers relating to the liberation of French territory after the war with Prussia was published the past summer in Paris: *La Libération du Territoire*, two volumes (Calmann-Lévy).

The varied activity of M. Léopold Delisle appears now in a *Catalogue des Livres Imprimés ou Publiés à Caen avant le Milieu du Seizième Siècle*, followed by investigations upon the printers and publishers of the same town. This is to be continued by a second volume devoted to texts which will reflect the masters and students of the university in the time of Charles VIII., Louis XII., and Francis I., and set forth the deliberations of the university concerning the book business of the time and the state of persons engaged in it. In this connection welcome may be said to a classified bibliography of writings relating to printing and publishing in France: *Essai de Bibliographie de l'Histoire de l'Imprimerie Typographique et de la Librairie en France*, by Paul Delalain (Paris, Picard).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Gravier, *Essai sur les Prévôts Royaux du XI^e au XIV^e Siècle* (Nouvelle Revue Historique du Droit, beginning in the July number); V.-L. Bourrilly, *Le Règne de François I^{er}, État des Travaux et Questions à Trailer*, concluded (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, June); *New Lights on the French Revolution* (Quarterly Review, July); *France under Thiers* (Edinburgh Review, July); J. Haller, *Der Ursprung der gallikanischen Freiheiten* (Historische Zeitschrift, XCI. 2); E. C. Lodge, *Serfdom in the Bordelais* (English Historical Review, July); W. M. Sloane, *Radical Democracy in France*, II. (Political Science Quarterly, June).

GERMANY.

An admirable account of the Hanse towns forms the nineteenth volume of the "Monographien zur Weltgeschichte": *Die Deutsche Hanse*, by Professor Dietrich Schäfer. Like the other numbers of the series the book is handsomely and elaborately illustrated (Leipzig, Velhagen und Klasing; New York, Lemcke and Buechner).

Among the recent publications on German history are several continuations of well-known works. The revised edition of Janssen, as edited by Pastor, has reached the eighth volume (Freiburg i. Br., Herder); E. Michael's third volume bears the subtitle "Deutsche Wissenschaft und deutsche Mystik während des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts" (*idem*); and the second of Lamprecht's volumes on contemporary Germany treats of "Wirtschaftsleben, soziale Entwicklung" (*ibid.*, Heyfelder).

Professor Ottokar Lorenz, of the University of Jena, has finished his *Kaiser Wilhelm und die Begründung des Reichs, 1866-1871* (Jena, G. Fischer).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. Stolze, *Die 12 Artikel und ihr Verfasser* (Historische Zeitschrift, XCI. 1); G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne Catholique entre 1800 et 1848. — I. La Réorganisation de l'Église* (Revue des Deux Mondes, July 15); F. Rachfal, *Österreich und Preussen im März 1848, I.* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, August).

EASTERN EUROPE.

Several valuable volumes were issued the past year by the Russian Historical Society. Two of them (109, 110) contain the despatches of the Austrian and English ambassadors in Russia in the eighteenth century. Another (113) gives the diplomatic correspondence of the Russian and French governments in the years 1814-1816.

The publication of a learned *History of Moscow* by I. Zabelin, was begun in Russia the past year. The first volume is devoted to the Kremlin, and gives the results of some twelve years' investigations.

A recent book by H. Marczali, professor in the University of Budapest, lists by epochs the sources of Magyar history in so far as these consist of chronicles, memoirs and descriptions, and gives extracts from them which reflect the social and political conditions in successive periods: *Enchiridion Fontium Historiæ Hungarorum* (Budapest, Athenæum). The work is intended as a manual for native students, but since most of the sources down to the nineteenth century are in Latin, it may be of interest also to many persons who do not read Hungarian.

AMERICA.

In the autumn list of Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin, and Co. are to be noted a new text-book on American history by J. N. Larned; a *Reader's History of American Literature*, by Thomas Wentworth Higginson; *American Tariff Controversies in the Nineteenth Century*, by Edward Stanwood, and a holiday edition of the late John Fiske's *Dutch and Quaker Colonies*, in two volumes. *The Memoirs of Rufus Putnam*, an autobiographical account of General Putnam and his ancestors, edited by Rowend W. Buell; *American History and its Geographic Conditions*, by Ellen C. Semple; *Louisiana*, by Albert Phelps (American Commonwealths) are among the new books in preparation.

The Macmillan Company announce for autumn publication *Select Charters and other Documents Illustrative of the History of the United*

States, 1861-1898, edited by Professor William MacDonald of Brown University; and a *Life of Robert Morris* by Dr. Oberholzer.

We select from the autumn announcements of D. Appleton and Co. *Life and Times of Thomas Jefferson*, by Thomas E. Watson; *Anthony Wayne*, by John R. Spears, and *Champlain, The Founder of New France*, by Edwin Asa Dix, in the series of "Historic Lives"; and *Steps in the Expansion of Our Territory*, by Oscar P. Austin, in the "Expansion Series". *Cortez*, by F. A. Ober, *Sir William Pepperell*, by Noah Brooks, and *George Rogers Clark*, by Reuben G. Thwaites are in preparation for the former series; and *Rocky Mountain Exploration*, by Reuben G. Thwaites, *The Conquest of the Southwest*, by Cyrus Townsend Brady, and *The History, Purchase, and Resources of Alaska*, by Oscar P. Austin, for the latter.

Following its printed author catalogue, so well begun, the Bibliothèque Nationale is issuing a classed catalogue of its collection of Americana — *Catalogue de l'Histoire de l'Amérique*, par George A. Barringer, bibliothécaire au département des Imprimés. The first volume is a small quarto of 854 pages, double columns, written in a handsome vertical cursive, printed by mimeograph, and issued in sheets. It comprises the narratives of exploration and discovery, general works on America, Canada, and the United States, religious and constitutional history, and our national and state documents. The titles are given with fullness and care; and the great library, so rich in material relating to this country, cannot be too highly commended for its enterprise in thus opening up its treasures to the knowledge of our students. The number of copies will naturally be limited, and the distribution in the United States is made through the Department of State.

Ernest Leroux, Paris, announces, as in preparation by Henry Vignaud, *Les Précurseurs de Barthélemy Diaz et de Christophe Colomb*. It will be a volume of critical notes upon all the Atlantic voyages preceding and preparatory to the discovery of the route to the Indies and to the New World. The same publisher also advertises *Villegagnon Roi d'Amérique, un Homme de Mer au XVI^e Siècle (1510-1572)*, by Arthur Heulard.

Volumes of interest to the genealogist are *The History of the Tremain, Tremaine, Truman Family in America; with the related families of Mack, Dey, Board and Ayers* (Press of the Ithaca Democrat, Ithaca, N. Y.), two large and weighty volumes, illustrated, and filled with a well-arranged mass of genealogical detail.

The *Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter* for July contains the concluding parts of Professor Benjamin Terry's "Die Heimstättengesetz-Bewegung"; "Deutsches Blut in den Vereinigten Staaten und in Illinois im neunzehnten Jahrhundert", a statistical study of German immigration and descendants, by Emil Mannhardt, and the first of a series of articles on "German Political Refugees in the United States during the Period from 1815-1860," by Ernest Bruncken.

Among the fall publications of G. P. Putnam's Sons are *Old Paths and Legends of New England*, by Katharine M. Abbott, and *Literary New York: Its Landmarks and Associations*, by Charles Hemstreet.

The last volume in the Colonial Series of the *Calendar of State Papers* is concerned with America and the West Indies from January, 1693, to May 14, 1696. The latter date is significant because it marks the end of the régime of the old Committee of the Privy Council for the Administration of Trade and of the Plantations.

The following are among the recent announcements of Messrs. Burrows Brothers, Cleveland: Esquemeling's *Bucaniers of America*, in four volumes, edited by Felix Neumann, of the Library of Congress; a translation of a life of Christopher Columbus by his son Fernando, edited by Professor E. G. Bourne; *New York; a reprint of An Historical and Geographical account of the Province and County of Pensilvania, and of West New Jersey in America*, by Gabriel Thomas, London, 1698, edited by Cyrus Townsend Brady. The same firm has recently issued in very attractive form *New York Considered and Improved, 1695*, by John Miller. The volume, which is published from the original manuscript in the British Museum, is provided with a long and careful introduction by Victor Hugo Paltsits.

An exact reprint of the second issue (1698) of Father Hennepin's *New Discovery* is promised for October by A. C. McClurg and Co., Chicago. The work is to be in two volumes, with facsimiles of the original title-pages, maps, and other illustrations. Mr. Reuben G. Thwaites furnishes the introduction, notes, and an analytical index, while Mr. Victor H. Paltsits, of the Lenox Library, contributes a bibliography of Hennepin.

It is reported that the two new volumes of Sir George Otto Trevelyan's work, *The American Revolution*, are in the press and will be issued by Messrs. Longmans, Green, and Company this fall. The same firm has just published *Actual Government, as applied under American Conditions*, by Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, a new volume in the "American Citizen" series.

A *Calendar of John Paul Jones Manuscripts in the Library of Congress*, to which reference was made in the last number of the REVIEW, is now published (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1903). It has been prepared by Dr. Charles Henry Lincoln. It makes a volume of 316 pages, including 883 entries, with a thorough index, and has for its frontispiece a fine portrait of Jones from the original bust by Houdon.

Part IV. of the Trumbull Papers (*Massachusetts Historical Collections*, Seventh Series, Vol. III., Boston, 1902) completes the publication of these interesting and valuable sources for the study of Revolutionary history. This last volume is not less important than the preceding. The letters range from January of 1780 to October, 1783, covering the last military events of the war, the treaty, and the approach of peace, and the financial frailties of the mendicant Confederation. There are letters

from Silas Deane, Oliver Ellsworth, Robert Morris, Robert R. Livingston, Jonathan Trumbull, Jr., and Washington, as well as from many other correspondents, discussing the important military and political conditions of the time. The papers were collected by Governor Trumbull himself with the intention that they should be preserved "as materials for future historians"; and there is some reason for thinking, we are told, that he thought seriously of writing a history of America himself. Whether he had such intention or not, the careful collection and preservation of his papers entitles the Revolutionary governor to the gratitude of American historical scholars.

An account of the identification of the site of Fort Washington in New York city, and of the erection and dedication of a monument on the spot, in November of 1901, by the Empire State Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, has been published by the society. It contains, besides the addresses customary on such occasions, a history of the defense and reduction of the fort written by Reginald Pelham Bolton, accompanied by several maps and plans of the fort and the neighborhood. It is published by E. S. Gorham, of New York.

The Congressional Library has recently added to its collection in the division of manuscripts some of the papers of William Paterson, delegate from New Jersey in the Federal Convention.

Mr. A. P. C. Griffin, of the division of bibliography of the Library of Congress, has compiled and edited a *Select List of Books on the Constitution of the United States* and also a *Select List of Books on the Cabinets of England and America* (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1903).

The American Advance, a Study in Territorial Expansion, by Edmund J. Carpenter, has been published by John Lane (London and New York, 1903, pp. ix, 331). Mr. Carpenter adheres to the Whitman story, saying that he is "not unaware that an iconoclastic attempt has recently been made to relegate the entire story of Whitman's ride and mission to the realm of fable."

Mr. Robert Brent Mosher, of the Department of State, has recently published an *Executive Register of the United States*, furnishing much valuable information, arranged by administrations, concerning the personnel of the various administrations and the origin of the several departments.

Mr. Gustavus M. Pinckney, of the Charleston Bar, has recently published with the Walker, Evans, and Cogswell Co., Charleston, S. C., a *Life of John C. Calhoun*.

John White Chadwick's *William Ellery Channing* (Houghton, Mifflin, and Co., 1903, pp. xvii, 463) tells in an entertaining way the life story of the great preacher and reformer. It contains among other things a good account of Channing's awakening to the evils of slavery and of the part he took in the antislavery movement.

Martha T. Hunter is the author of a memoir of her father, Robert M. T. Hunter (Washington, The Neale Publishing Co., 1903, pp. 166). The book is pleasantly written and is largely made up of letters, most of which, however, are of personal rather than of general interest.

The First New York (Lincoln) Cavalry from April 19, 1861, to July 7, 1865, has been written by Mr. William H. Beach, adjutant of the regiment, and published by the Lincoln Cavalry Association (New York, 1902, pp. vii, 559). It is an interesting narrative of the experiences of the regiment, which saw a great deal of service in Virginia during the four years of the war. Most of the matter will be of chief interest to the survivors of the regiment, for whom perhaps the book is chiefly intended, but there are entertaining details of the daily life of the common soldier. Noteworthy is Sergeant Charles R. Peterson's diary of nine months' imprisonment in Andersonville.

The sixteenth volume of the Second Series of the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* (Boston, 1903), contains the papers that were read at the regular meetings in the year 1902. It includes, among other valuable contributions, "Rev. John Higginson, of Salem," by Simeon E. Baldwin; "Cotton's 'Moses his Judicials,'" by Worthington C. Ford; and the paper on "The Historical Conception of the United States Constitution and Union," by Daniel H. Chamberlain, to which reference has previously been made in the REVIEW. Nearly 175 pages are taken up with the "Diary of John Quincy Adams, while a law student in Newburyport," an interesting paper containing the "record of the life of a young man of twenty, brought up in the Europe of Louis XVI., Catherine II., and George III., suddenly transferred to America, and planted in . . . a substantial seaport of some five thousand inhabitants, largely engaged in commerce." The diary is copiously annotated. No use was made of this material in the *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*.

The Research Publishing Company of Boston are undertaking the publication of an illustrated subscription work in three volumes on *New England Colonial Aristocracy*. It is being issued in eighteen bimonthly parts: Volume I. deals mainly with economic, political, and social conditions of early New England; Volume II. with the origin and subsequent history of prominent New England families; Volume III. with their descendants and connections. Mr. Eben Putnam is the editor.

The first publication of the Club for Colonial Reprints of Providence, Rhode Island, is *The Fourth Paper presented by Major Butler, with other papers edited and published by Roger Williams in London, 1652* (Providence, 1903, pp. xxiii, 49). An introduction and notes are supplied by Clarence Saunders Brigham. They show the place of the pamphlet in the constitutional history of the time, 1652, the close relationship between the Puritans of Old and of New England, and the effort that was making to securing "religious liberty without weakening the power of the civil authority." *The Fourth Paper* itself is printed in facsimile. Of the original pamphlet only two copies are known to be extant, one

in the John Carter Brown library, the other in the British Museum. This is said to complete the reprints of the known tracts of Roger Williams. The edition is limited. The club offers for sale the numbers not taken by the members of the club. (Address George P. Winship, Providence.)

The Finances and Administration of Providence, 1636-1901, by Howard Kemble Stokes (Extra Volume XXV. in the "Johns Hopkins University Studies," 1903, pp. vii, 464), is not simply an exposition of present conditions or of recent tendencies. A large portion is given up to a consideration of early methods under the old town system, and the whole constitutes a detailed history of the financial administration of Providence from its foundation to the present. Certain portions were written originally as a doctor's thesis at Brown University.

The Grafton Press of New York announces the *History of Wethersfield, Connecticut*, by Dr. Henry L. Stiles.

President Dwight's *Memories of Yale Life and Men, 1845-1899* (New York, Dodd, Mead, and Co., 1903, pp. 500), is full of interest to the student of educational and general social history. It has much to do with the personnel of the university during an important half-century of its growth, and for this reason will be of special interest to Yale graduates. But, written in a charmingly simple and direct style, it will appeal also to the general reader and to the student of American progress.

The Connecticut Historical Society are publishing the "Roll of Connecticut Men in the French and Indian War", 1755-1762. Volume IX. of their collections (Hartford, 1903) contains the first volume of these rolls, extending from 1755 to 1757.

Dr. Franklin B. Dexter has reached the third volume of his *Yale Biographies and Annals* (Henry Holt and Co.) covering the period 1763-1773. Like its predecessors, this volume contains much accurate and valuable as well as minute and curious information.

Transcripts with index of "Some Early Records of the Lutheran Church, New York", is the most important historical feature of the *Year Book* of the Holland Society of New York for 1903.

Mr. William Nelson edits Volume XXII. of the *New Jersey Archives, Documents relating to the Colonial History of New Jersey*, which is devoted to marriage records, 1665-1800. The editor in a valuable introduction discusses the early marriage-laws of New Jersey with some attention to those of adjacent colonies.

Aside from continuations, the most noteworthy contributions to the July number of *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* are "How the News of the Battle of Lexington reached Philadelphia", in which a facsimile of the despatch sent from Watertown on the morning of April 19, 1775, is reproduced; "Some Love Letters of William Penn", all falling within the year 1695, selected from the Penn-Forbes collection of manuscripts presented to the historical society by William Brooks Rawle; "The American Philosophical Society, 1743-1903", a reprint of Mr. J. G. Rosengarten's address at the annual dinner of the society,

April 3, 1903. A list is given of the most valuable manuscripts and documents relating to colonial Pennsylvania acquired by the Historical Society last May. From the same periodical we learn that the last assembly passed an act creating a division of public records, in connection with the State Library, devoted to the preservation of all public records throughout the commonwealth, and especially those of the state government not in current use, from the earliest times to the year 1750.

Dr. Julius Friedrich Sachse has expanded his chapter on Justus Falckner in *German Pietists* into a memorial volume entitled *Justus Falckner, Mystic and Scholar* (Philadelphia, printed for the author, 1903, pp. iii, 141). The occasion for the publication is the bicentennial "of the first regular ordination of an orthodox pastor in America." Much new material is presented, the most noteworthy being the diploma of ordination of Falckner of November 24, 1703. The book is profusely illustrated with reproductions of old prints, with modern pictures of the scenes of Falckner's labors, and with facsimile reprints of old title-pages and of documents.

The following are some recently published works relating to Pennsylvania local history: *Captain Gustavus Conyngham, a Sketch of the Services he rendered to the Cause of American Independence*, by Charles Henry James, published by the Sons of the American Revolution, 1903; *The Order-Book of Fort Sullivan and Extracts from Journals in General Sullivan's Army relating to Fort Sullivan*, by Mrs. Louise Welles Murray, The Tioga Point Historical Society, Athens, Pa., 1903; *History of Franklin and Marshall College*, by Joseph Henry Dubbs, Lancaster, 1903.

Mr. Oscar Jewell Harvey, Wilkesbarre, Pa., is expected to publish in January of the coming year his *History of Wilkesbarre, Luzerne County, Pa.*, a work on which he has been engaged for several years. The author is said to have treated the Revolutionary and colonial periods of the Wyoming Valley with exceptional fullness.

The May number of the *Publications of the Southern History Association* opens with an account of the proposed publication of the rosters of those who served in the Confederate army during the Civil War. This forms part of a general scheme to publish a complete roster of officers and enlisted men of the Union and Confederate armies and will be published as a continuation of the *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*. The work is authorized by an act of Congress of February 25, 1903, and will be under the general supervision of the Secretary of War; but in the more immediate charge of Brigadier General F. C. Ainsworth, Chief of the Record and Pension Office. The present article reports what has already been done by the various states of the Confederacy towards preserving a record of their troops. In the same number F. W. Moore, Ph.D., of Vanderbilt University, begins a series of papers entitled "Calhoun as seen by his Political Friends," consisting mainly of letters of Duff Green, Dixon H. Lewis, and Richard

K. Crallé during the period from 1831 to 1848. There are appended sketches of the history and nature of the materials, and of the characters and careers of the writers. Also we note the beginning of a series of selections from the correspondence of Judge James Duane (1732-1797), bearing mainly in Revolutionary, Southern, and early educational history. The first instalment extends from 1761 to 1789. The July number of the *Publications* is devoted mainly to a continuation of documents the printing of which was begun in an earlier number: "Texas Revolutionary Sentiment," "The Duane Letters," "General Joseph Martin," "Calhoun as seen by his Political Friends." The first document is a letter to Thomas H. Miller, concerning the capture of St. Mary's, Georgia, by Admiral Cockburn.

According to the *Virginia Magazine of History*, July, 1903, in *Gleanings of Virginia, An Historical and Genealogical Collection, largely from original Sources*, compiled and published by William Fletcher Boogher, Washington, D. C., 1903, the author has gathered some new and interesting matter and reprinted some things that will be serviceable to those who do not have access to Hening's *Statutes at Large* of Virginia.

In addition to continuations, the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* for April contains much interesting matter. The "Proceedings of the Virginia Committee of Correspondence, 1759-1767" is taken from the original papers in the Virginia state archives. This committee consisted of members of the council and the house of burgesses appointed to correspond with the colony's agent in England, Edward Montague, Esq., of the Middle Temple. W. F. Dodd contributes a study prepared in the constitutional history seminary at the University of Chicago on "The Effect of the Adoption of the Constitution on the Finances of Virginia," which is largely occupied with a history of Virginia finances from 1776-1790. While the *Calendar of Virginia State Papers* was being published the editors discovered various papers after the volumes covering the appropriate dates had been issued. It was originally intended to publish these in a separate volume, but that intention was never carried out. Although the papers are not of any great importance, the *Virginia Magazine of History* has undertaken to print them to complete the set. The remainder of the executive documents are in the present number, and the legislative documents will be continued later. In the series on Virginia newspapers in public libraries an annotated list is given of those in the Virginia State Library. In the July number Mr. Lothrop Withington contributes a group of documents with explanatory notes relating to the "Surrender of Virginia to the Parliamentary Commissioners, March, 1651-1652." The most important feature is the report of the commissioners, from the British Museum Library, which gives the first contemporary account of the surrender known to historians. Among the papers published under "Virginia in 1638-1639" are Governor Wyatt's commissions and instructions. Captain H. T. Owen, of Virginia, furnishes

a list of Virginians who have become governors of other states from 1779 to 1865.

History is well represented in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* for July. Professor Edwin Mims, of Trinity College, writing on "The Reform Movement in New England," treats briefly but ably certain intellectual leaders of the first half of the last century and their attitude toward the problems of their time, particularly antislavery. Dr. U. B. Phillips, in "The Economics of the Plantation", considers agriculture in the south, especially since the Civil War. The second of Mr. Walter M. Fleming's articles on the peace movement in Alabama is entitled "The Peace Society, 1863-1865." Henry Rudolf Dwire writes on "The New York Times and the Attempt to Avert the Civil War." The importance of the attitude of this paper was due to the fact that its editor, Henry J. Raymond, was close to Seward, and hence would reflect his policy. The author concludes that the failure of attempts like that of the *Times* prove that the contest was inevitable.

The Autobiography of Joseph Le Conte (Appleton, 1903, pp. xvii, 337) is not without its value to the student of history, and must be of interest to anyone who enjoys reading a simple tale of a noble life. The book is edited by William Dallam Armes, who has made changes in the original manuscript, mainly in the way of omitting personal passages, and of inserting certain portions from Professor Le Conte's journal or other writings. Born on a plantation in South Carolina in 1823, Le Conte spent most of his life in that state till he went to the University of California in 1869.

In the July number of the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* begins a series of letters from Rev. Samuel Thomas, appointed first missionary to the Province of Carolina, July 3, 1702, by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. The letters are to officers of the society and were copied from the society's manuscript volumes. Those so far published, covering the years 1702-1710, seem to be chiefly of a personal nature, though here and there occur items of a more general historical interest.

With the appearance of the May issue of the *Gulf States Historical Magazine* Mr. Thomas M. Owen resigned from the editorship to devote himself more exclusively to his duties as director of the Alabama Department of Archives and History. Mr. Owen is succeeded as editor and proprietor by his former associate, Mr. Joel C. Du Bose.

In the *Gulf States Historical Magazine* for May, 1903, Mr. Dunbar Rowland, director of the Mississippi Department of History and Archives, reprints a letter, dated January 2, 1804, from Wm. C. C. Claiborne, Governor General of the Province of Louisiana, to James Madison, Secretary of State. Mr. Rowland states that Governor Claiborne's private executive journal in possession of the Archives from which the letter is taken, contains much valuable material relating to the Louisiana purchase. Wm. Beer, of the Howard Memorial Library, New Orleans, has

a series of bibliographical notes on material relating to the history of the Gulf states previous to the beginning of the nineteenth century. The editor furnishes a list of newspaper files in the Carnegie Library, Atlanta, Ga., and Miss Mary Robinson contributes a list of Alabama newspaper files in the library of the American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Mass. Among the articles in the July number are: "Recollections of the Growth and Development in the North of the Anti-Slavery Sentiment that led to Secession", by Judge Wm. D. Wood; "John Bell, Constitutional Union Candidate for President in 1860", by Miss Sallie Fleming Ordway. Under the title "An Alabama Protest against Abolition", Mr. Owen publishes a series of contemporary documents illustrative of the contest between the South and the abolitionists in the thirties; Miss Mary Robinson furnishes a list of the Mississippi newspaper files in the American Antiquarian Society Library.

Mr. Thomas M. Owen, director of the department, has compiled for the Department of History and Archives of Alabama, an *Alabama Official and Statistical Register* (Montgomery, Ala., Brown Printing Co., 1903, pp. 326). It contains much material of historical and genealogical interest, *e. g.*, short biographical sketches of state officers, lists of population and elections, and, what would seem of most value, lists of the organization and personnel of each of the constitutional conventions of the state, 1819-1901, with a complete bibliography of the literature of each.

It is announced that Messrs. Manzi, Joyant, and Co., New York, have in preparation an illustrated four-volume *History of Louisiana*, by Alcée Fortier, professor of romance languages in Tulane University and president of the Louisiana Historical Society. The edition is to be a limited one sold only on subscription.

The first instalment of "Early Addresses and Messages of the Governors of Tennessee" in the *American Historical Magazine and Tennessee Historical Society Quarterly* for July presents those of Governor John Sevier, 1796-1801. In the series on "Military Government in Alabama under the Reconstruction Acts" Mr. Walter L. Fleming deals with the administration of General Pope. Judge Nathaniel Baxter's "Reminiscences" furnish a good introduction to the "Executive Correspondence of Governor James K. Polk", from originals in the archives of the Secretary of State's office, both of which appear in this issue.

The June number of the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia* contains among other articles "Letters Concerning Missions of the Mississippi Valley, A. D. 1818-1827." These letters are translated from *Annales de l'Association de la Propagation de la Foi* (Lyons, 1826-1827).

Concerning the Forefathers is the title of a handsome book written by Charlotte Reeve Conover (Dayton, Ohio, 1903). It is a memoir of Colonel Robert Patterson and Colonel John Johnston, with some notice

of other members of the Patterson and Johnston families. Robert Patterson was one of the early pioneers of Kentucky, an Indian fighter of distinction, one of the founders of Losantiville, *i. e.*, Cincinnati, and one of the early settlers of Dayton. While the volume is intended to be only a memorial, with its many illustrations and its reprints of documents it is not an unimportant contribution to the history of the West.

Mr. F. H. Turner has in the *Quarterly of the Texas Historical Association* for July, 1903, an exhaustive paper on the expedition of Colonel Jose Antonio Mejia to Texas in July, 1832.

The July number of the *Iowa Journal for History and Politics* opens with an article on "The Wisconsin Gerrymander of 1891, 1892, A Chapter in State Constitutional History," by Mr. Francis Newton Thorpe. Of more local interest is an article on congressional districting in Iowa, by Paul S. Peirce. An accompanying series of maps show the "exact form and extent of the districts established by the several acts of the General Assembly." Miss Margaret Buckingham furnishes a "Bibliography of Iowa State Publications for 1900 and 1901".

The Iowa State Historical Society have already issued three volumes of their projected series of *Messages and Proclamations of the Governors of Iowa*, edited by Professor B. F. Shambaugh. The second volume contains the messages of Governors James W. Grimes, Ralph P. Lowe, and Samuel J. Kirkwood; the third includes the proclamation and messages of Governors William Milo Stone and Samuel Merrill. This brings the series down to 1872.

Mr. R. R. Bowker has in preparation a provisional list of the publications of the state of Iowa.

The Lewis and Clark field-notes, in possession of the American Philosophical Society, of Philadelphia, are being prepared for publication by Mr. Reuben Gold Thwaites. This edition is to be published as a part of the centennial celebration of the Lewis and Clark expedition.

"The Lewis and Clark Centennial, the Occasion and its Observance," by Professor F. G. Young, forms the subject of the opening article of the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* for March. It comprises a brief sketch of Oregon history, a discussion of the importance of the acquisition and opening up of the territory, and a description of the places for the proposed observance. In the same issue are printed a number of contemporary letters describing conditions in Oregon in the forties. In the June number may be noted "Oregon and its Share in the Civil War," by Robert Treat Platt; "The Great West and the Two Easts," a survey of the resources and progress of the territory west of the Mississippi during the last fifty years, by Henry E. Reed; "Social and Economic History of Astoria," by Alfred H. Cleveland. The documents include: "Two Whitman Sources", papers "relating to the Oregon Emigration Movement, 1842-1843"; "Experiences of the Emigration of 1843"; and "Letters descriptive of Oregon and its Earlier Conditions."

The report of the military governor of Porto Rico on civil affairs (Part 13 of the *Annual Reports of the War Department* for the year ending June 30, 1900, pp. 470-471) contains a brief account of the historical collections relating to the island and tells where they are to be found. The account is reprinted in the *Gulf States Historical Magazine*, March, 1903, pp. 371-372.

The Arthur H. Clark Company, Cleveland, whose history of the Philippine Islands was originally intended to extend only to 1803, have decided to include the nineteenth century, while keeping the number of volumes within the limits already announced — fifty-five. The new title will be *The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Morse Stephens, *John Fiske as a popular Historian* (*World's Work*, April); Emil Reich, *A New View of the Revolutionary War* (*North American Review*, July); Elsie Bessie Atwater, *In the Courts of Kings, Connecticut Agents Who Appeared before the Throne in Appeals for Justice* (*Connecticut Magazine*, April-May); Charles E. Magoon, *The War Department—Administration of Civil Government* (*Scribner's Magazine*, July); Matthew E. Hanna, *The First Year of Cuban Self-Government* (*Atlantic Monthly*, July); A. Viallate, *Les préliminaires de la guerre hispano-américaine et l'annexion des Philippines par les États-Unis* (*Revue Historique*, July-August); Bernard C. Sterner, *Two Eighteenth Century Missionary Plans* (*Seawance Review*, July); Andrew D. White, *Chapters from my Diplomatic Life* (*The Century*, August-September).

